



City of Saint Paul
Mayor Melvin Carter

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, April 8, 2019 at 3:30 p.m.

George Latimer Central Library – 4th Floor Conference Room

MEETING MINUTES

Members Present:	Rebecca Airmet, Larvel Bunker, Joel Clemmer, Raymond Hess, Amy Huerta, Samakab Hussein, Paul Raymond, Corina Serrano, Darren Tobolt
Members Excused:	Pat McQuillan, Elsa Vega Perez
Members Absent:	Mary Morse Marti, Elizabeth Matakis
Visitors and City Staff Present:	Madeline Mitchell – OFS Budget Analyst Marissa Peterson – OFS Budget Analyst Alice Messer – Parks Anne Weber – Public Works Holly Huston – City Council Jane McClure - Press



City of Saint Paul

Mayor Melvin Carter

700 City Hall

15 West Kellogg Boulevard

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102-1658

Telephone: (651) 266-8800

Facsimile: (651) 266-8541

1. Call to order – The meeting was called to order by Chair Amy Huerta at 3:36 p.m.
2. Approval of Agenda
Airmet moved to approve the agenda for the April 8, 2019 meeting. Bunker seconded. The agenda was approved.
3. Approval of January 14, 2019, February 11, 2019, and March 11, 2019 Meeting Minutes
The minutes were approved by general consent.
4. Action Items

February resolutions

Airmet moved to act on all February resolutions with one vote. Hess seconded. The motion passed. Airmet offered a brief summary of February resolutions and moved to approve. February resolutions 19-33, 19-51, 19-52, and 19-53 were approved.

March resolutions

Airmet moved to act on all March resolutions with one vote. Airmet provided a brief summary of March resolutions. Tobolt moved approval. Airmet seconded. Resolutions 19-69, 19-72, 19-87, 19-65, 19-66, and 19-70 were approved.

PARKS

RES PH 19-90: Amending the financing and spending plan in the Department of Parks and Recreation in the amount of \$1,590,300 to reflect additional 2019-20 Metropolitan Council Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funding for the Phalen Regional Park Master Plan Implementation project and giving permission for the proper city officials to enter into an agreement with the Metropolitan Council, which includes an indemnification clause.

- Bryan Murphy presented the resolution to the committee. Murphy explained:
 - o The master plan for Phalen was completed in 2010. Many of the projects in the plan required more study to complete. Funding was received for the first phase of project. This part involves Phalen Beach, lakeside, and the picnic pavilion. This project was recently advertised for construction. With this amount of funding, the department will be able to do beach area and lakeside center. The department has alternatives for the south end and picnic pavilion. The state has just awarded another \$1.6M which will be in place by the start of construction. Design should start this fall with construction next summer/fall.
- Clemmer asked whether the state approved the \$1.6M for this specific purpose? Murphy clarified that it was specifically for this area of the Phalen Master Plan.
- Raymond asked about the indemnification clause. Sawyer explained that this language is a requirement from Minnesota Management and Budget specific to the use of state bonding dollars. comes from state bonding dollars. Bonding from the Met Council tends to be smaller and does not usually have this language but it is standard for state bonding.

- Hess asked if this is just for the beach and the beach house. Murphy explained that this resolution covers the south end of the park and the picnic pavilion. The beach house and lakeside center are already funded via the first phase.
- Tobolt moved approval. Clemmer seconded. The resolution was approved. Raymond noted that there was an error that needed to be resolved in the text of the resolution to be consistent. The department agreed to make the correction.

RES PH 19-92: Amending the financing and spending plan in the Department of Parks and Recreation in the amount of \$134,303 to reflect Parks Acquisition Opportunity Fund (PAOF) funding for the Robert Piram Regional Trail project.

- Paul Sawyer presented the resolution. Sawyer explained:
 - o One small component of the updates to the Robert Piram trail required a number of easements for property owners where right-of-way was not sufficient to carry the trail. The Met Council has a funding stream that covers 75% of easement acquisition costs. The Parks department is able to use that funding for the east frontage road near Holman Field. Legacy funds provided the remaining 25%. This resolution is to accept the grant funds to make the project budget whole.
- Tobolt noted that this trail has been a long time coming and he is excited to see it coming together.
- Clemmer moved approval; Hess seconded.
- Huerta asked if the project is on track for completion. Sawyer confirmed and noted that the project is going to go out to bid in May, with an expected start date of late July or early August. With an 18 month completion estimate, the project should be finished by Spring 2021 at the latest, Fall 2020 if all goes well.
- The resolution was approved.

PUBLIC WORKS

RES PH 19-91: Amending the financing and spending plans in the Public Works Capital Budget by transferring \$737,709 in 8-80 revenues to balance out various 8-80 project budgets.

- Anne Weber presented the resolution. Weber explained that this is the beginning of an effort to look at balances of 8-80 projects to adjust if there are any balances left or if we need additional balances in some of them. This funding goes back to 2014.
- Airmet noted that the committee reviewed a request for \$1.2M for Margaret Street last July and that this is another 50% above that. Weber explained that the resolution in July added \$1.2M in MSA. At that time, the scope was also increased (added sidewalks, added closure at Margaret and Johnson, etc.) Bids came in higher than the estimate so the department had to come back with this resolution.
- Airmet asked for the total cost of the Margaret Street project. Weber will send at a later date.
- Airmet asked whether construction has started. Weber confirmed it has and that it should be finished next spring.
- Raymond moved approval; Clemmer seconded. The resolution was approved.

RES PH 19-102: Amending the 2019 financing and spending plans in the Department of Public Works Operating and Capital Budgets by reallocating \$1,800,000.

- Weber presented the resolution. Weber explained:
 - o The 2019 budget included an additional \$1M for citywide pedestrian improvements that went along with both downtown mill and overlay and citywide mill and overlay. Funding was put into the street maintenance fund. This resolution moves it to the sidewalk program where it will be spent. The 2019 budget also included \$500k for bikes which needs to be moved to capital to be spent.
- Airmet asked whether this program is similar to the bridge improvement/maintenance fund? Weber explained that there is a bike/ped safety program with dedicated money. This resolution adds additional funds to bikeway projects so it is not competing with pedestrian projects (splitting bike and ped to not compete for the same dollars).
- Clemmer asked why the funds were not directly deposited in the budget category to which they belong. Weber noted she was not sure but these funds were associated with mill and overlay so they were initially put in with operations.
- Bunker asked whether this is different money than what was put into Summit for the bikeway. Weber answered that was a separate, stand-alone project that used contingency to fund.

- Tobolt asked whether this was for bike/ped generally or specific projects. Weber explained that the transportation planners and pedestrian coordinator looked at all projects and came up with a prioritized list dependent on how much funding was received.
- Tobolt asked if this resolution is for downtown exclusively. Weber said it is for downtown, Arlington, Cleveland, Prior, and St. Clair mill and overlays. \$500k is for bikeway improvements.
- Tobolt asked which section of St Clair. Weber answered Fairview to Snelling.
- Airmet asked whether bike improvements are also associated with mill and overlay. Weber explained that they are still in development phase.
- Tobolt asked whether the department will come back before the committee before the money is spent. Weber answered that standalone projects would, but this money is for a program now so it would not need to.
- Airmet moved approval; Tobolt seconded. The resolution was approved.

CIB Bylaws

- Chair Huerta opened the discussion of the CIB Committee bylaws
- Clemmer asked about who was in charge of drafting changes. Airmet responded that she intended to but did not have time and had questions about the legality of online voting.
- Mitchell noted that the City Attorney's Office can review whatever the committee proposes.
- Huerta suggested that the committee make recommendations on electronic voting and then discuss changes to the attendance policy. Huerta asked if everyone was in favor of electronic voting.
- Airmet noted that the main recommendations considered at previous meetings were to strike the distinction between excused and unexcused absences and to check in on people who had two consecutive unexcused absences or four absences in a twelve-month period.
- Bunker responded that an absence is an absence and recalled discussion around building in alternatives but adding parameters around use. She expressed her support for in-person as the primary form of participation and online involvement as the exception, not the rule.
- Tobolt said the committee needs give members an option of other ways to be involved but also incentivize attendance, perhaps via an allotted amount of online participations. Tobolt also noted possible technology constraints.
- Huerta asked about technology capabilities, noting that presentation materials may be difficult to convey. Huerta also agreed that in-person participation is important and should be the primary way of interacting with the committee.
- Airmet said she had heard that elected officials cannot participate in a meeting by skype unless they are in a public location but is unsure if the same applies to committee appointees.
- Clemmer laid out two possible uses of electronic participation: 1) member cannot attend in person but can dial in. Clemmer expressed concern that so much information comes from being at this meeting and it could be difficult to ensure the same information is available remotely. 2) an urgent need arises between monthly meetings that requires committee approval immediately. Clemmer noted he was more comfortable gathering by technology in that case than in the first.
- Bunker agreed, saying that perhaps an urgent/immediate need is the only instance where electronic participation is an option and perhaps the other situation requires access where the full meeting information can be shared (Skype, etc.)
- Clemmer said the important thing creating an equal information base to all decision makers.
- Airmet warned that it can be challenging, technology-wise. Who would provide the infrastructure – the City or the chair, as in other volunteer organizations?
- Raymond asked whether putting language in the bylaws would require that technology is in place or if there is a way to just put it in as an option for the future pending details on technology – perhaps at the discretion of the chair or with preapproval.
- Tobolt suggested that if the problem is about the need for a timely vote, we should discuss codifying the specifics of online voting, rather than online participation for meetings. We could require that everyone review the minutes from the meeting and respond within a particular time.
- Airmet agreed on the need for a contingency voting apparatus. It has been done before but we should decide what it looks like.
- Hess suggested online voting at the discretion of the chair.
- Airmet added that it should be in consultation with the city liaison regarding timeliness.
- Bunker asked what options the committee has to weigh in on what constitutes an emergency.
- Serrano suggested a timeline for responding to departments.

- Raymond asked whether there have been times outside of the quorum issues that the committee has been asked to vote between meetings. If not, it could be limited to meetings without quorum at the chair's discretion.
- Airmet did not think there has been a time when the committee has been asked to do an emergency vote. If there is no quorum, perhaps portions of the meeting could be recorded and distributed to those who were not at the meeting to review before voting electronically.
- Clemmer said this would help but not satisfy the equal information issue as some information is visual and would have to be put online for review. Clemmer also asked whether this would make not attending too easy.
- Bunker said the core issue is quorum and there must be a way to communicate whether members can or cannot attend before the meeting.
- Raymond noted that if there needs to be a vote, it should be at the chair's discretion. Raymond also agreed on the need for a policy regarding absences, that online voting is not the same as being present. If person is missing all meetings and just voting online, that needs to be dealt with.
- Airmet said that if the committee knew ahead of time whether there was going to have quorum, meetings could be canceled ahead of time.
- Hess reiterated the idea an absences policy of two consecutive meetings or four overall.
- Huerta stated that other committees require advance notice for call-ins or absences. Electronic voting is used rarely. There need to be parameters on what's on the agenda, etc.
- Tobolt added that perhaps if we don't have quorum by a few days before the meeting, it could be canceled. This would require an affirmative response from members.
- Serrano asked if the committee should reassess the time and date of meetings if there has been a problem with attendance.
- Airmet noted that this has come up in the past but we do not currently know the reasons members are missing meetings. Airmet offered that perhaps we should look into the reasons members cannot come before changing meeting times. Airmet noted that there are city employees who are on the clock for these meetings.
- Huerta agreed that members are aware of the times and dates of meetings during the application process. An application should be an understanding that the date and time works.
- Bunker mentioned that she does not want to start investigating why people can or cannot attend meetings, but rather do a better job of restating the commitment and encouraging restraint on missing meeting, perhaps through a better orientation process.
- Raymond said he was in favor of looking at times if it makes it easier for members to attend, provided it is not in the bylaws.
- Airmet thought the time/date of the meeting is in the standing rules. Airmet also noted that different people can make different times and that a better orientation could help provide understanding of what the committee is here to do and a deeper commitment to the process, which may be unclear right now due to the redesign.
- Clemmer asked whether the chair or co-chair would be willing to take responsibility for incorporating these ideas into the bylaws language.
- Huerta responded yes, but that Airmet will be out of town for the next two meetings, and that she would like to see more clarity around absences.
- Raymond proposed that if someone is gone too many times in one 12 month period, someone could bring a motion to vote about whether to ask for a resignation.
- Airmet supported the idea, noting it allowed flexibility between maternity leave or other special circumstances and just not showing up. Airmet also noted that meeting materials should be sent out the Friday before and responded to with a confirmation of attendance to get a headcount ahead of time.
- Hussein said that he thought that might help, noting that the committee is volunteer work but if someone cannot make it, they need to email the secretary to let them know. Hussein agreed that responding to an email on Friday seems reasonable.
- Clemmer expressed support for requiring an affirmation of intent to attend.
- Tobolt circled back to online voting, noting that there should be something in the bylaws about this option. Ideally, we should not have to change the bylaws more than once.
- Raymond asked whether these discussions invite disputes about the stipend down the road.
- Huerta noted that the city is aware that there are 5 openings on the committee and are looking for applicants.

- Bunker noted that she does not feel comfortable voting someone off of a volunteer committee.
- Huerta responded that it's currently at the discretion of the chair but it would be nice to move away from that a bit.
- Raymond suggested that this is the beauty of democracy - if no one is comfortable voting someone off, perhaps they should stay on.
- Huerta expressed understanding that this is a volunteer commitment, but we're in the middle of a lot of stuff (redesign, CDBG, etc).
- Huerta offered to write a new draft of the bylaws and requested this topic be added to the May agenda.

5. New Business –

- Chair Huerta met with the City to discuss appointments, etc. going to add standing agenda item.
- Mitchell provided an update on committee assignments. Paul Raymond and Darren Tobolt are signed up to serve on the Capital Planning Team for the next phase of the process.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned by general consent.

Staff:

Madeline Mitchell (651-266-8803)

madeline.mitchell@ci.stpaul.mn.us

<http://www.stpaul.gov/cib>