

The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners met with the following members present: Bennett, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman and Chair Parker – 7. Absent: - None. Also present were Julie Kleinschmidt, County Manager, and Gary Davis, Assistant County Attorney.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

### AGENDA

Commissioner McDonough moved approval of the Agenda of the March 3, 2009, Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Rettman. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0.

### MINUTES

Commissioner Reinhardt moved approval of the Minutes of the February 17, 2009 Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Rettman. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0.

### PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE – One application to convey a tax forfeited property by use deed, in accordance with the targeted neighborhood requirements, to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, a political subdivision- PIN 35-29-23-14-0159

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-078)

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, has submitted one application for conveyance by Use Deed for a parcel of tax-forfeited land from the State of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, The property is described as follows:

Lot 7, Chute Brothers Division No. 7 Addition to the City of St. Paul, Minn.

PIN: 35-29-23-14-0159

PA: Between 702 & 710 Charles Ave., St. Paul MN 55104

Commissioner District 3; and

WHEREAS, The Tax Forfeited Lands section has determined that the parcel is located in a targeted neighborhood, as defined in Minnesota Statutes, section 469.201, subd. 10, and within an eligible census tract, as defined by City Council Resolution #03-922; and

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul intends to use the property for new home development; and

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul has determined it necessary to obtain the parcel of tax-forfeited land in order to provide for the redevelopment of the land as productive taxable property; and

*(Continued)*

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul has determined that this need will otherwise not be met by solely relying upon private initiative or redevelopment; and

WHEREAS, This action is in compliance with Minnesota Statutes, sections 282.01, subd. 1b(a) & (b); Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners has reviewed the application for conveyance by Use Deed of a parcel of tax-forfeited land located in a targeted neighborhood, and within an eligible census tract; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the application to convey the property located between 702 & 710 Charles Ave., PIN: 35-29-23-14-0159, to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul, Minnesota, exclusively for the redevelopment as productive taxable property; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, If a net profit is made on the sale of the property, the County respectfully requests consideration by the City of St. Paul of a 40-40-20 split of the proceeds.

PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE – One application to convey a tax forfeited property by use deed, in accordance with the targeted neighborhood requirements, to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, a political subdivision- PIN 36-29-23-13-0122

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-079)

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, has submitted one application for conveyance by Use Deed for a parcel of tax-forfeited land from the State of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, The property is described as follows:

The North 40 feet of Lots 5 and 6, Block 22, except the North 8 feet conveyed to the City of St. Paul for alley purposes, Warren & Rice's Addition to Saint Paul.

PIN: 36-29-23-13-0122

PA: North of 520 Farrington St., St. Paul MN 55103

Commissioner District 3; and

WHEREAS, The Tax Forfeited Lands section has determined that the parcel is located in a targeted neighborhood, as defined in Minnesota Statutes, section 469.201, subd. 10, and within an eligible census tract, as defined by City Council Resolution #03-922; and

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul intends to use the property for new home development; and

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul has determined it necessary to obtain the parcel of tax-forfeited land in order to provide for the redevelopment of the land as productive taxable property; and

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul has determined that this need will otherwise not be met by solely relying upon private initiative; and

WHEREAS, This action is in compliance with Minnesota Statutes, sections 282.01, subd. 1b(a) & (b); Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners has reviewed the application for conveyance by Use Deed of a parcel of tax-forfeited land located in a targeted neighborhood, and within an eligible census tract; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the application to convey the property located North of 520 Farrington St, PIN: 36-29-23-13-0122, to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul, Minnesota, exclusively for the redevelopment as productive taxable property.

RESOLVED, If a net profit is made on the sale of the property, the County respectfully requests consideration by the City of St. Paul of a 40-40-20 split of the proceeds.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES Citizens Advisory Council – Community Human Services Citizens Advisory Council member appointments

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-080)

WHEREAS, Several committees of the Community Human Services Citizens Advisory Council have membership vacancies; and

WHEREAS, The County’s open appointment process was followed to obtain applications; and

WHEREAS, The Citizens Advisory Council recommends applicants listed in the attached Membership Appointment Recommendations be appointed to serve on the committees identified for the terms noted; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby ratifies the appointment of the following individuals to serve on the committees of the Community Human Services Citizens Advisory Council, with terms specified:

<u>Adult Services Committee</u>	<u>Term Expiration Date</u>
Janell Wampler	12/31/10
Geraldine Thompson	12/31/10
Kathleen Montgomery	12/31/10
<u>Adult Mental Health Committee</u>	<u>Term Expiration Date</u>
Susan Mercurio	12/31/10

(Continued)

<u>Children's Services Review Panel</u>	<u>Term Expiration Date</u>
Janet Arleth	12/31/10
Barbara Otto	12/31/10
Jacquelyn A. Thomas	12/31/10

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Elderly Services – Agreement with Blue Cross/Blue Shield

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-081)

WHEREAS, In 2006, Ramsey County entered into a contract with the Blue Plus health plan to serve seniors in the Minnesota Senior Health Options (MSHO) program and the Minnesota Senior Care Plus (MSC+ program); and

WHEREAS, The Human Services Department requested additional staff in 2006 for the increased numbers of elderly projected to be served under MSHO, but did not request positions for MSC+ at that time; and

WHEREAS, MSC+ has now been implemented by the State of Minnesota as planned on January 1, 2009. The number of referrals has significantly exceeded expectations; and

WHEREAS, To meet this service demand and our contractual obligation, the Community Human Services Department is requesting an increase in the complement of 4.0 FTE Social Worker IIIs to provide care coordination services to elderly individuals enrolled in the Blue Plus health plan and referred to the Department for services; and

WHEREAS, The early history with the Blue Plus contract indicates payments from the health plan are and will continue to be sufficient to fund positions the new positions; and

WHEREAS, The Human Services Department will only fill the new positions as the referrals and revenue generated from the Blues Plus programs is adequate; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves an increase in the complement of the Community Human Services Department of 4.0 FTE Social Worker III to provide care coordination services to elderly citizens enrolled in Blue Plus health plan.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Developmental Disability Services

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-082)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Human Services Department requests renewal of an agreement with Kaposia, Inc. for clerical support services, for the period of January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009; and

WHEREAS, The Department has benefitted from this service for over 15 years; and

*(Continued)*

WHEREAS, Six individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities compile information packets for individuals applying for health insurance or cash assistance, organize large mailings and set up audio/visual equipment for meetings; and

WHEREAS, The Department is also proposing to amend an agreement with Thomas Allen, Inc. for Vulnerable Adult/Developmental Disabilities (VA/DD) Target Case Management; and

WHEREAS, Thomas Allen has provided case management for Ramsey County Human Services for over 18 years; and

WHEREAS, Under this VA/DD Target Case Management amendment, the County is reimbursed through Medical Assistance for approximately 50% of the cost of this service; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to approve an agreement with Kaposia, Inc., 380 East Lafayette Freeway South, Suite 212, St. Paul, MN 55107, in an amount not to exceed \$45,902, for clerical support services for the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to approve an agreement with Thomas Allen, Inc., 1550 Humboldt Avenue, West St. Paul, MN 55118, in an amount not to exceed \$153,500, for Vulnerable Adult/Developmental Disabilities Targeted Case Management Services, for the period January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to execute the agreements in a form to be approved by the County Attorney.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Case Management Services

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-083)

WHEREAS, Community Human Services issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) on October 27, 2008, seeking one or more agencies to provide Case Management services for adults and children with disabilities who receive funding through one of the following home and community based Medical Assistance waiver services funding: Community Alternatives for Disabled Individuals (CADI), or Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) program; and

WHEREAS, The Request For Proposals was sent to 196 agencies. Thirteen agencies submitted a proposal. The five agencies that received the highest evaluation scores were asked to interview; and

WHEREAS, The Community Human Services Department has the service need to select up to two new vendors. The Review Committee is recommending two vendors for contract; and

WHEREAS, Selection criteria included: 1) Effectiveness of service design; 2) Relevant skill and expertise; 3) Financial stability and solvency; and 4) Cost effectiveness; and

*(Continued)*

WHEREAS, As part of the effectiveness criteria, the Review Committee looked at each agency's ability to address clients of various backgrounds; and

WHEREAS, Meridian Services has a Russian interpreter, a staff person from Cameroon and a strong history of serving the deaf community, and they are currently hiring new Spanish-speaking staff; and

WHEREAS, People Inc. has solid experience serving African Americans and Hmong populations;

WHEREAS, Both of the agencies will be able to absorb new individuals for service within their current staffing; and

WHEREAS, Funding for these services will be through two of the Medical Assistance Waiver programs - Community Alternatives for Disabled Individuals (CADI) and Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI); and

WHEREAS, If approved, the Board through Resolution 2001-424, has authorized the Director of Community Human Services to sign contracts involving waiver funding. There is a daily cap for each individual's waiver and the money is paid directly by the state to the vendors; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves People, Inc., 317 York Ave., St. Paul, MN 55130, and Meridian Services, 9400 Golden Valley Rd., Golden Valley, MN 55427, to provide Case Management services for adults and children with disabilities who receive funding through CADI or TBI programs in Ramsey County, at the medical assistance rates, for the period March 1, 2009 to December 31, 2012.

**RAMSEY COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY – Gibbs Museum Sewage Line Project**

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-084)

WHEREAS, Gibbs Farm Museum, as operated by the Ramsey County Historical Society, needs a new sewage line to alleviate sewage problems caused by an antiquated system and increased use of the site; and

WHEREAS, During the six-month season of operation in 2008, sewage problems developed which manifested by repeated flooding of the basement of the original farmhouse; and

WHEREAS, A new diagnosis of the problem has identified that the current sewer system, holding tank, and pump are unable to handle the volume and pump-clogging of this active historic site; and

WHEREAS, The proposed solution is a new sewage line from the red barn directly to the city's street connection which bypasses the farmhouse directly; and

***(Continued)***

WHEREAS, On February 5, 2009, the Capital Improvement Program Citizens' Advisory Committee (CIPAC) reviewed and recommended an appropriation transfer of \$25,000 from the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Contingent Account to the Ramsey County Historical Society Gibbs Farm Museum Sewage Line Project; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the \$25,000 project for the Ramsey County Historical Society's Gibbs Farm Museum Sewage Line; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the transfer of \$25,000 from the Capital Improvement Program Contingent Account to the Ramsey County Historical Society Gibbs Farm Museum Sewage Line Project.

PUBLIC HEALTH – Second Amendment to Agreement for Physical Therapist Services at the Ramsey County Adult Detention Center and the Ramsey County Correctional Facilities

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-085)

WHEREAS, The Health Care programs at the Adult Detention Center ("ADC") and the Ramsey County Correctional Facility ("RCCF", "BTT", "JDC") provide physical therapy care on-site for detainees and inmates; and

WHEREAS, In past years, it has proven to be most cost effective, based in part on utilization, to have a contractual agreement with a physical therapist to provide appropriate on-site services; and

WHEREAS, In 2007, Darin Haugland provided physical therapy services on an as-needed, as-requested basis at the Adult Detention Center and the Ramsey County Correctional Facilities under an Agreement with the County for a cost not to exceed \$10,000; and

WHEREAS, The Agreement was amended in 2008, to extend the term through December 2010, with no change in the maximum cost; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Haugland has provided physical therapy services in a professional and satisfactory manner and understands the objectives of physical therapy in short-term detention and correctional facilities; and

WHEREAS, Due to a significant and unanticipated increase in the demand for physical therapy services for incarcerated persons, the Sheriff's Office and the Department of Community Corrections are requesting approval of a Second Amendment to the Agreement with Darin Haugland, to increase the total contract sum by \$24,000, for a total contract sum of \$34,000; Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the Second Amendment to the Agreement with Darin Haugland, 10684 Alicia Circle, Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077, to increase the total contract sum for physical therapy services at the Ramsey County Adult Detention Center and at the Ramsey County Correctional Facilities by \$24,000, for a total contract sum of \$34,000, with maximum payments of: \$10,000 from January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2008; and \$24,000 from January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2010; and Be It Further

*(Continued)*

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Chair and Chief Clerk to execute the Second Amendment with Darin Haugland, subject to prior approval by the County Attorney’s Office and Budgeting and Accounting.

HUMAN RESOURCES – Terms of collective bargaining agreement with Teamsters Local 320 (Correctional Officer 1/2) for years 2009, 2010 and 2011

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-086)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and the Teamsters Local 320 (Correctional Officer 1/2) engaged in collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS, Negotiations resulted in a tentative agreement on terms and conditions of employment for 2009, 2010 and 2011; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the implementation of a three year agreement on terms and conditions of employment for the Teamsters Local 320 (Correctional Officer 1/2), effective January 1, 2009, for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 as follows:

WAGES

- 3% increase effective 1/1/09
- 2% increase effective 1/1/10
- 1.99% increase effective 3/1/11

All general salary increases will be effective the first full pay period following the effective date.

DEFERRED COMPENSATION

Effective January 1, 2011, the County will increase its matching contribution to deferred compensation from \$10.00 per month to \$15.00 per month, per contributing employee. Deferred compensation contributions will be pro-rated for part-time employees.

INSURANCE

	2009	2010	2011
Single coverage			
Employee Pays	\$21/mo	\$26/mo	\$31/mo
Split of Premium	100% employer	80% employer	75% employer
Increase for Family	0% employee	20% employee	25% employee

Changes will be effective on January 1 of each year, except that for 2011, the County will pay the entire increase in premium for family medical coverage until March 1, 2011.

Dental -

For the year 2009, employees will receive the full 5.6% premium decrease. For the year 2010, the employee will pay the total premium increase. For the year 2011, the County and the employee will split the increase or decrease in premium 50/50 for single or family coverage. All premium rates are effective January 1 of each year.

(Continued)

Retiree Insurance -

Early Retiree Contributions for Employees Retiring in 2009, 2010, 2011 – The County will continue to make the same contribution to medical insurance premiums for early retirees as for active employees, for employees retiring during the term of this contract. County contributions are subject to the years of service requirements previously established by the County Board.

Regular Retiree Minimum Payment For Employees Retiring During the Term of the Contract:

	2009	2010	2011
Single	\$30/mo	\$35/mo	\$35/mo
Family	\$70/mo	\$80/mo	\$80/mo

All changes effective January 1 each year of contract.

HEALTH CARE SAVINGS PLAN

Effective the first full pay period in 2011, for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 1/1/06 and for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 7/1/92 who opted into the HCSP:

- The County will contribute \$520 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 5 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$624 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 10 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$728 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 15 year anniversary date.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE

The annual clothing allowance for Correctional Officers will increase from the 2008 allowance of \$660, in each of the three years of the agreement, as follows: 2009 - \$690; 2010 - \$700; 2011 - \$710.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The agreement reached provides for miscellaneous changes to the Union Security, Discipline, Vacation and Sick Leave articles.

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with the Teamsters Local 320 (Correctional Officer 1/2) and authorizes the Chair of the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and the County Manager, as representatives of the County, to approve and sign the agreement incorporating these terms.

HUMAN RESOURCES – Terms of collective bargaining agreement with Teamsters Local 320 (Community Corrections Workers) for years 2009, 2010 and 2011

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-087)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and the Teamsters Local 320 (Community Corrections Workers) engaged in collective bargaining; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, Negotiations resulted in a tentative agreement on terms and conditions of employment for 2009, 2010 and 2011; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the implementation of a three year agreement on terms and conditions of employment for the Teamsters Local 320 (Community Corrections Workers) effective January 1, 2009, for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 as follows:

WAGES

- 3% increase effective 1/1/09
- 2% increase effective 1/1/10
- 1.99% increase effective 3/1/11

All general salary increases will be effective the first full pay period following the effective date.

DIFFERENTIAL PAY

Effective 4/1/09 the weekend shift differential will increase from \$.25 to \$.30 per hour for Saturday, and from \$.30 to \$.35 per hour for Sunday.

DEFERRED COMPENSATION

Effective July 1, 2009, the County will increase its matching contribution to deferred compensation from \$15.00 per month to \$20.00 per month, per contributing employee. Deferred compensation contributions will be pro-rated for part-time employees.

MILEAGE ALLOWANCE

Effective 1/1/09, the allowance for use of a personal automobile will increase from \$2.50 to \$2.75 per day, plus the mileage reimbursement rate established by the IRS.

TUITION REIMBURSEMENT

Effective 1/1/09 increase maximum reimbursement per year from \$500 to \$750.

INSURANCE

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Single coverage Employee Pays	\$21/mo	\$26/mo	\$31/mo
Split of Premium Increase for Family	100% employer 0% employee	80% employer 20% employee	75% employer 25% employee

Changes will be effective on January 1 of each year, except that for 2011, the County will pay the entire increase in premium for family medical coverage until March 1, 2011.

Dental -

For the year 2009, employees will receive the full 5.6% premium decrease. For the year 2010, the employee will pay the total premium increase. For the year 2011, the County and the employee will split the increase or decrease in premium 50/50 for single or family coverage. All premium rates are effective January 1 of each year.

(Continued)

Retiree Insurance -

Early Retiree Contributions for Employees Retiring in 2009, 2010, 2011 – The County will continue to make the same contribution to medical insurance premiums for early retirees as for active employees, for employees retiring during the term of this contract. County contributions are subject to the years of service requirements previously established by the County Board.

Regular Retiree Minimum Payment For Employees Retiring During the Term of the Contract:

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Single	\$30/mo	\$35/mo	\$35/mo
Family	\$70/mo	\$80/mo	\$80/mo

All changes effective January 1 each year of contract.

HEALTH CARE SAVINGS PLAN

Effective the first full pay period in 2011, for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 1/1/06 and for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 7/1/92 who opted into the HCSP:

- The County will contribute \$520 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee’s 5 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$624 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee’s 10 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$728 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee’s 15 year anniversary date.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The agreement reached provides for miscellaneous changes to the Holiday and Sick Leave articles that are consistent with other County labor agreements.

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with the Teamsters Local 320 (Community Corrections Workers) and authorizes the Chair of the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and the County Manager, as representatives of the County, to approve and sign the agreement incorporating these terms.

HUMAN RESOURCES – Terms of collective bargaining agreement with Technical Employees Association for years 2009, 2010 and 2011

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-088)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and the Technical Employees Association engaged in collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS, Negotiations resulted in a tentative agreement on terms and conditions of employment for 2009, 2010 and 2011; Now, Therefore, Be It

(Continued)

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the implementation of a three year agreement on terms and conditions of employment for the Technical Employees Association, effective January 1, 2009, for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 as follows:

WAGES

- 3% increase effective 1/1/09
- 2% increase effective 1/1/10
- 1.99% increase effective 3/1/11

All general salary increases will be effective the first full pay period following the effective date.

DEFERRED COMPENSATION

Effective July 1, 2009, the County will increase its matching contribution to deferred compensation from \$15.00 per month to \$20.00 per month, per contributing employee. Deferred compensation contributions will be pro-rated for part-time employees.

INSURANCE

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Single coverage Employee Pays	\$21/mo	\$26/mo	\$31/mo
Split of Premium Increase for Family	100% employer 0% employee	80% employer 20% employee	75% employer 25% employee

Changes will be effective on January 1 of each year, except that for 2011, the County will pay the entire increase in premium for family medical coverage until March 1, 2011.

Dental -

For the year 2009, employees will receive the full 5.6% premium decrease. For the year 2010, the employee will pay the total premium increase. For the year 2011, the County and the employee will split the increase or decrease in premium 50/50 for single or family coverage. All premium rates are effective January 1 of each year.

Retiree Insurance -

Early Retiree Contributions for Employees Retiring in 2009, 2010, 2011 – The County will continue to make the same contribution to medical insurance premiums for early retirees as for active employees, for employees retiring during the term of this contract. County contributions are subject to the years of service requirements previously established by the County Board.

Regular Retiree Minimum Payment For Employees Retiring During the Term of the Contract:

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Single	\$30/mo	\$35/mo	\$35/mo
Family	\$70/mo	\$80/mo	\$80/mo

All changes effective January 1 each year of contract.

HEALTH CARE SAVINGS PLAN

Effective the first full pay period in 2011, for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 1/1/06 and for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 7/1/92 who opted into the HCSP:

- The County will contribute \$520 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 5 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$624 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 10 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$728 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 15 year anniversary date.

TUITION REIMBURSEMENT

Effective 1/1/11 increase maximum reimbursement per year from \$1,000 to \$1,300.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The agreement reached provides for miscellaneous changes to the Holiday, Vacation, Sick Leave, HCSA, and Part-Time Employee articles, comparable to provisions in other collective bargaining agreements and Ramsey County Personnel Rules.

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with the Technical Employees Association and authorizes the Chair of the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and the County Manager, as representatives of the County, to approve and sign the agreement incorporating these terms.

HUMAN RESOURCES – Terms of collective bargaining agreement with International Union of Operating Engineers Local 70 for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-089)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 70 engaged in collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS, Negotiations resulted in a tentative agreement on terms and conditions of employment for 2009, 2010 and 2011; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the implementation of a three year agreement on terms and conditions of employment for the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 70, effective January 1, 2009, for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011 as follows:

WAGES

- 3% increase effective 1/1/09
- 2% increase effective 1/1/10
- 1.99% increase effective 3/1/11

(Continued)

All general salary increases will be effective the first full pay period following the effective date.

DEFERRED COMPENSATION

Effective July 1, 2009, the County will increase its matching contribution to deferred compensation from \$15.00 per month to \$20.00 per month, per contributing employee. Deferred compensation contributions will be pro-rated for part-time employees.

INSURANCE

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Single coverage Employee Pays	\$21/mo	\$26/mo	\$31/mo
Split of Premium Increase for Family	100% employer 0% employee	80% employer 20% employee	75% employer 25% employee

Changes will be effective on January 1 of each year, except that for 2011, the County will pay the entire increase in premium for family medical coverage until March 1, 2011.

Dental -

For the year 2009, employees will receive the full 5.6% premium decrease. For the year 2010, the employee will pay the total premium increase. For the year 2011, the County and the employee will split the increase or decrease in premium 50/50 for single or family coverage. All premium rates are effective January 1 of each year.

Retiree Insurance -

Early Retiree Contributions for Employees Retiring in 2009, 2010, 2011 – The County will continue to make the same contribution to medical insurance premiums for early retirees as for active employees, for employees retiring during the term of this contract. County contributions are subject to the years of service requirements previously established by the County Board.

Regular Retiree Minimum Payment For Employees Retiring During the Term of the Contract:

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Single	\$30/mo	\$35/mo	\$35/mo
Family	\$70/mo	\$80/mo	\$80/mo

All changes effective January 1 each year of contract.

HEALTH CARE SAVINGS PLAN

Effective the first full pay period in 2011, for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 1/1/06 and for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 7/1/92 who opted into the HCSP:

- The County will contribute \$520 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 5 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$624 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 10 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$728 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 15 year anniversary date.

(Continued)

OTHER PROVISIONS

The agreement reached provides for miscellaneous changes to the Sick Leave article.

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 70 and authorizes the Chair of the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and the County Manager, as representatives of the County, to approve and sign the agreement incorporating these terms.

HUMAN RESOURCES – Terms of collective bargaining agreement with AFSCME Council 5, Local 8 (Assistant County Attorney Unit) for years 2009, 2010 and 2011

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-090)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and AFSCME Council 5 bargaining representatives have reached a tentative agreement on terms and conditions of employment for 2009, 2010 and 2011 for the AFSCME Local 8 (Assistant County Attorney Unit), representing County employees; and

WHEREAS, The AFSCME Local 8 (Assistant County Attorney Unit) has ratified the agreement reached in bargaining; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves a three year agreement on terms and conditions of employment for the AFSCME Local 8 (Assistant County Attorney Unit), effective January 1, 2009, for the years 2009, 2010 and 2011, as follows:

WAGES

3% increase effective January 1, 2009

2% increase effective January 1, 2010

1.99% increase effective March 1, 2011

All increases effective the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following effective date.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSE FEES AND ADMINISTRATIVE ALLOWANCE

Increase the \$940 per year administrative allowance to \$965 effective January 1, 2011.

DEFERRED COMPENSATION

The employer will increase its matching contribution to deferred compensation from \$20.00 per month to \$25.00 per month per contributing employee, effective July 1, 2009, and the matching contribution will be pro-rated for part-time employees.

INSURANCE:

MEDICAL INSURANCE

For the year 2009, employees shall continue to contribute \$21.00 per month for single coverage. For the year 2010, employees shall contribute \$26.00 per month for single coverage. For the year 2011, employees shall contribute \$31.00 per month for single coverage. The County and employees will

*(Continued)*

share the premium increase in family coverage each year on the following basis:

2009 - 100% County/0% employee

2010 - 80% County/20% employee

2011 - 75% County/25% employee

Changes will be effective on January 1 of each year, except that for 2011, the County will pay the entire increase in premium for family medical coverage until March 1, 2011.

DENTAL INSURANCE

For the year 2009, employees will receive the full 5.6% premium decrease. For the year 2010, the employee will pay the total premium increase. For the year 2011, the County and the employee will split the increase or decrease in premium 50/50 for single or family coverage. All premium rates are effective January 1 of each year.

RETIREE INSURANCE

Early Retiree Contributions for Employees Retiring in 2009, 2010, 2011 – The County will continue to make the same contribution to medical insurance premiums for early retirees as for active employees, for employees retiring during the term of this contract. County contributions are subject to the years of service requirements previously established by the County Board.

Regular Retiree Minimum Payment For Employees Retiring During the Term of the Contract:

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	
Single	\$30/mo	\$35/mo	\$35/mo
Family	\$70/mo	\$80/mo	\$80/mo

All changes effective January 1 each year of contract.

HEALTH CARE SAVINGS PLAN

Effective the first full pay period in 2011, for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 1/1/06 and for insurance-eligible employees hired on or after 7/1/92 who opted into the HCSP:

- The County will contribute \$520 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 5 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$624 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 10 year anniversary date.
- The County will contribute \$728 per year to the HCSP on a per pay period basis beginning the 1<sup>st</sup> full pay period following the employee's 15 year anniversary date.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The agreement reached includes miscellaneous revisions in the sick leave and wage articles.

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the terms of the collective bargaining agreement with AFSCME Council 5, Local 8 (Assistant County Attorney Unit) and authorizes the Chair of the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners and the County Manager, as representatives of the County, to approve and sign the agreement incorporating these terms.

(Continued)

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Monthly Report of Contracts and Final Payments and Grant Submissions that were approved during the month of January 2009

Commissioner Carter introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-091)

WHEREAS, Administrative Code 3.40.37 authorizes the County Manager to approve contracts, within certain limits; and

WHEREAS, Administrative Code 4.30.50a requires a monthly report on all contracts and final payments approved by the County Manager; and

WHEREAS, Administrative Code 4.30.39d requires the County Manager to report grant submissions, amendments, renewals, and acceptances along with the monthly contract report; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby accepts the Report of Contracts and Final Payments and Grants for the month of January 2009.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Board and Lodge Services for Adult Men with Chemical Dependency or Co-occurring Chemical Dependency and Mental Illness

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the draft resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Carter.

Commissioner Rettman said that when she first asked for the layover of this item, she was under the impression that a map of multiple transparencies could be made to show this Board where all government-type services are located throughout the County – everything from correctional facilities to GRH, Rule 36, Rule 8, and foreclosures. She felt that in the days of talks about collaboration and collocation with other governmental entities, while at the same time being committed to decentralizing places like Anoka Regional Treatment facility to more neighborhood oriented settings, maps could exist so the Board can ensure that certain neighborhoods are not replete with economic challenges that are detracting from opportunities for jobs, all-income housing, and hope. We cannot silo services in certain areas and neighborhoods without creating or exacerbating a disparity which we advocate against. Those maps should be snapshots that would show not only census, they are sporadic and never show the intensity and density where certain neighborhoods are being besieged and creating a silo. It is difficult for certain neighborhoods to break out of poverty. The layover was not against group residential housing nor against Transition Home's goals and aspirations and the work they plan to do. It is about a 2006 resolution that said that Transition Homes would locate in one of three properties in the Merriam Park area, for 10 beds. According to Transition Homes, they were informed that the Jackson Street property was available by our Ramsey County staff, though they were told that was not the case. Because of economic conditions they are asking for 10 beds but are requesting 20 beds, in an economically depressed area which already has its fair share, if not more than its fair share, of intensity and density. It was in a few months under the City of St. Paul's rules, this property special condition use permit (CUP) would have reverted back to residential uses. Not long ago, this property was being looked at by Episcopal Homes to build senior housing which is needed in this neighborhood. She is disappointed that Transition Homes did not find suitable locations within the County, even with economic conditions where there could be many properties available for such a location that are not already so populated.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Rettman requested Commissioners to not approve these 20 beds; but if it must be approved, approve 10 beds rather than 20 beds. She said District 6 was never informed that the original resolution passed in 2006 was 10 beds; it went up because of economic conditions. She will not support the motion.

Commissioner Rettman moved amendment of the resolution to 10 beds. Commissioner McDonough seconded the amendment.

Commissioner Carter asked if anyone could address the District 6 support for the CUP and the letter they sent to the City, and whether they are in support of the 20 beds.

Commissioner Rettman said the district councils are advisory to elected officials. What they were offered was that this was a CUP to what was previously located there. Tapestry previously had 20 beds so it was presented that this is adding only one additional unit; it did not have the full clarity that the resolution passed by this body in 2006 was only for 10 beds; it was only presented as a 20-bed + one facility to the District Council. They did not have an opportunity to look at the 10 beds because they were only looking at the CUP similar to the one that had previously been there.

Commissioner Reinhardt will not support the amendment because when this was laid over we thought that possibly District 6 approval was in dispute and made it very clear that if there was a change in District 6 position, it should be brought forward. They have had ample time; if there was some miscommunication that took place they should have been here to tell us they have reversed their position. They still remain in support of the 20 beds and therefore, she will honor what the District Council has approved.

Commissioner McDonough will support the amendment. When these items come before us we become muddled in the premise of concentration and how these things are sited and where they are located, rather than the quality of programming and need for that programming. He agrees that this is a high-quality program and the need is there, but he will support the amendment. He supports not putting the service there. This area is concentrated with service providers and those types of services that puts a community in a position to never being able to recover, change or become something other than a provider of services. We should not set up a community to be that.

Commissioner Carter said the District Council letter approves the 20 beds plus the on-site manager. She wants to make certain that that number was in their minutes, and it is. Having reviewed that, and also understanding the previous layover, she will be supporting the main motion.

Commissioner Rettman said that those services approved in December 2006, had 10 or less beds per location. Transition Homes was determined to be for 10 beds at one of three addresses in Merriam Park; that was not conveyed to the District Council.

Commissioner Ortega said there is a policy about concentration of poverty. There is a great need to house people; this is not a matter of housing people, but the Board has a policy where we took at stand against concentrating not just these types of services but other types of services and units of housing. He has a conflict between the need that must be met and not continuing to add to these neighborhoods. Perhaps the policy should be revisited and today's economic conditions be discussed. As the economy gets worse the need will be greater, and the concentration will become greater. He will support the reduction to 10 beds.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the Commissioners have been provided various maps. The Executive Summary states that in 2008 there were 133 homes within the City of St. Paul and 217 in the suburban areas of the County. The reality is that there is more area in the suburban area than in the City of St. Paul. She recognizes that there are many different types of homes; the homes and services are provided throughout the County. If we get to the point where the only thing we care about is what is only in our backyard, she would bring up Maplewood. District 6 Council, the neighborhood that should be the most concerned about what goes into their neighborhood, was fully aware of what they were

*(Continued)*

voting on. After our last discussion, if they didn't go back to make certain what it was they were voting on, they should have. It is not our responsibility, as a County Board, to do that. She believes they knew what they were voting on; it is in their neighborhood. They apparently believed this was an appropriate use and something that was needed in their neighborhood. Services are spread out throughout the County; to make it sound otherwise is not fair. There is clearly a concentration in some areas of Maplewood; we have tried to work with them on this, just as we have worked with District 6. She will not support the reduction because it is micromanaging what the neighborhood has already approved.

Commissioner McDonough said a policy on concentration of poverty is in place. It continues to come back to us because the providers, by default, tend to gravitate where they can afford to purchase the property, which tends to be in the same areas. He has seen this struggle throughout his eight years on the Board; perhaps the Board's role should be to try to find ways to fill the gap so these providers don't have to continue to come back. They provide needed services in a quality way but they continue to come back to us to put us at odds with our own policy because they continue to ask for approval to have these placed in the same neighborhoods.

Commissioner Bennett asked if neighborhood meetings were held.

Commissioner Rettman said the land use meeting was held. Their job is to look at a specific parcel. The issue she raises is not the city's issue but the County's issue in terms of making sure that our county survives and thrives completely. They do not get into the larger issue. Their comprehensive plan talks about decreasing the poverty and concentration. They are working on their plan. Their discussion was about doing 20 beds and re-establishing a special condition use permit that was due to expire.

Commissioner Bennett asked if the general public was there or just the District Council.

Commissioner Rettman said it was the District Council.

Commissioner Bennett said there is a difference, because district councils don't always represent everyone. He asked the year the building at 1609 Jackson was built.

Commissioner Rettman responded it was likely 40-50 years ago.

Commissioner Reinhardt asked if anyone from District 6 was present. We have relied on the district councils in the past. They knew this was an issue.

Chair Parker responded that she did not see anyone present.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that speaks volumes.

Commissioner Rettman said this is not a situation where the District 6 Planning Council did their job; they made their advice on looking at the parcel. That is different from what she is trying to say. This Board has said that we want to make sure that we look at the entire County and not create additional disparities in some neighborhoods. That is what this discussion is about. The District Council did their job based on the facts they were provided, which was limited to 20 beds.

Chair Parker believes Ramsey County's role is to assure that all of the needed services are available in the community. We are talking about board and lodging services for adult men with chemical dependency or co-occurring chemical dependency and mental illness. This is an important service that needs to be provided in the community, and is the type of service that is difficult no matter where it is located. The County Board's job is to make sure these services are provided. If we let every neighborhood have veto power over what would be located where, we would not be able to have any of our services located in the communities, and would be back to having big institutions, which is what we are trying to get away from. She believes this is an important service and that the Board's role is to make sure it is managed well. We are not in the land use business – that is the City's role. We are in the location of the service and making sure they are managed well in the communities. We can do that through our contracts. If there are community complaints they must be dealt with, but it is not the service itself that is wrong. It could be poor management. That is what we have to focus on.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Carter said the Board respects the desires of the neighborhood as we look at the approval of these kinds of siting. To the extent that this was laid over with that as an objective, we wanted to make sure it was approved at the District Council. She heard from Commissioner Rettman's comments that there is a concern; having a responsibility in an area means a lot. The Board must address and create the kinds of programs that can assist neighborhoods. We have talked about that responsibility. She believes that is the County's responsibility. She doesn't believe the Board has denied its role in doing so or the opportunity to work with communities to understand when they need more help from the County. She has not heard from the community since this item was laid over. She has the same concern within her communities, and wants the Board to continue to be mindful of its role in housing and addressing homelessness and ensuring that these kinds of solutions exist and are spread across the County. She will support the original motion in recognition of the need and of our partnership with communities in their approval of these sitings. She will not support the amendment to reduce the number of beds.

Commissioner McDonough said he will not support the amendment, even though he seconded the motion. For him it is not an issue of whether it is 10 beds or 20 beds; the issue is that another location should be found for these services.

Commissioner Bennett asked if this would be the largest number of beds.

Kurt Koehler, Community Human Services, said that most similar facilities are over 20 beds. There about 145 beds for men and about 133 for women scattered throughout the County, most in St. Paul. Most of the facilities are around 25 beds. They are on the East Side, on Summit Avenue, and downtown St. Paul. He said the property at 1609 Jackson was a 20-bed chemical dependency and mental illness treatment facility for women until June 2008, at which time the program moved to 135 Colorado and expanded. Staff have looked at the budget for this program and 10 beds is not viable financially.

Commissioner Rettman said she made the motion to amend to 10 beds as a compromise. We are not holding Merriam Park accountable but we are holding District 6 accountable. She is talking about a neighborhood that even in 2000 was already in forced poverty. This is a good neighborhood that has a lot of hope, but it is bleeding because it has foreclosures and vacant houses and facilities and needs uplifting. Economic viability is not okay in Merriam Park but it is okay to do it here. She wanted to just vote no on this issue but decided to try her best. She appreciates the time to discuss the issue; we have the policy and get involved in making sure that our siting of facilities is real. The district council did their job; we need to do ours.

Commissioner Ortega said this issue has come up too frequently. Over the past months, this Board has contradicted itself many times in terms of policy. He requested that a workshop be scheduled on this item; he has more topics for workshops on other policy discussions. This is not a housing issue, it is not a chemical dependency issue, but has to do with the Board's policies. They have to be cleaned up and the Board needs to stick to them. We are slowly drifting away and soon there won't be any rhyme or reason about how we do business. Economic conditions are not going to get better any time soon; perhaps it is the role of the County to make the difference in that gap and make sure folks are housed. He believes in normalization; we need to put people and families in communities like those we all live in, not in areas where the concentration becomes so overbearing with these types of services. We need a policy discussion to see how we will address this, and that all communities will bear an equal share and for what is best for the individuals.

Chair Parker agreed that it is time to have that type of discussion in a workshop.

Roll Call on the amendment to keep it at 10 beds: Ayes – Rettman – 1. Nays – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Bennett, Parker – 6. Motion to amend failed.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Rettman said she would not support the original motion, but stated that it does mean she is against GRHs being located, and would prefer going back to the original addresses.

Gary Davis, Assistant County Attorney, said that as a point of clarification, the actual number of people in the facility would be 21 – 20 people receiving services and a manager. Roll Call on original motion: Ayes – Carter, Ortega, Reinhardt, Parker – 4. Nays – McDonough, Rettman, Bennett – 3. (2009-092)

WHEREAS, On December 12, 2006, following a Request for Proposals process, the Ramsey County Board approved four vendors to provide Group Residential Housing services for adults with chemical dependency or co-occurring chemical dependency and mental illness; and

WHEREAS, Three of the four programs began operating in 2007: Emma Norton Services, 670 North Robert Street, St. Paul, MN 55101 – 10 beds for women; Juel Fairbanks Chemical Dependency Services, 816 North Albert Street, St. Paul, MN 55104 – 7 beds for women; Freedom House, 426 Oxford Street N. & 1038 Aurora Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104 – 20 beds for men; and

WHEREAS, The fourth provider, Transition Homes, originally scheduled to locate in the Merriam Park area, has continued to search for a suitable home; and

WHEREAS, During this period, the service at 1609 Jackson Street relocated to another building; and

WHEREAS, The building at 1609 Jackson, which previously served as a nursing home, an intermediate care facility for individuals with developmental disabilities, and a chemical dependency treatment program, provides a suitable structure for the GRH service; and

WHEREAS, Transition Homes approached the District 6 Council to review the planned service and received their support for utilization of the building; and

WHEREAS, With that support, they have since applied for the necessary Board and Lodging license from the City of St. Paul, which was issued February 3, 2009; and

WHEREAS, The building has a capacity to serve 20 individuals; and

WHEREAS, The original approval was for 10 beds; and

WHEREAS, With the support for this location and the capacity of the building, the Community Human Services Department proposes to utilize an additional 10 beds from the closure of another Group Residential Housing program, transferring them to 1609 Jackson and adding them to the Transition Home contract; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to approve an agreement with Transition Homes for 20 Group Residential Housing beds for adult men with Chemical Dependency or Co-occurring Chemical Dependency and Mental Illness, at 1609 Jackson Street, St. Paul, MN 55117-3917, for the period January 15, 2009 through December 31, 2013; and Be It Further

***(Continued)***

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to execute the agreement, in a form to be approved by the County Attorney, and to make the necessary budget adjustments.

PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE – One application to convey a tax forfeited property by use deed, in accordance with the targeted neighborhood requirements, to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, a political subdivision- PIN #s 32-29-22-22-0071; 32-29-22-22-0105; 32-29-22-22-0106; 32-29-22-22-0107; 32-29-22-22-0110; 32-29-22-22-0111; 32-29-22-22-0112; 32-29-22-22-0113

Commissioner Ortega asked staff to explain these properties.

Cindy Carlson Heins, St. Paul Planning and Economic Development, said these sites are commonly referred to as the Ravoli site. It is by the railroad area and has been an unused dumping ground for a long time. The HRA owns several lots in this area; they have been actively involved in the clean-up of those lots with the intention of developing them for housing. The particular lots that have gone tax forfeit are on the left side of the road as you enter the area. To support the housing, which would likely be the next step for the HRA on their lots, the City needs to clean these lots up. She doesn't believe that in their current state they are developable by an outside developer, but with the economy being as it is, she doesn't know how soon anything other than clean up will occur. It is essential that the City control these properties and do the clean up now.

Commissioner Bennett asked if these properties are located next to the area where bocce ball used to be played.

Ms. Carlson said the HRA owns the property where the bocce ball courts were located. That property had been cleaned up.

Commissioner Bennett said this property has a beautiful view of the Capitol and Cathedral.

Commissioner Rettman asked what the consequences would be if the Board decided to wait a year or so to make a determination on this property.

Ms. Carlson doesn't know how soon the housing would go forward. It would be important to have control of the area just to clean it up. It is essential to have some control if the properties next door that are going to be developed. She does not know the time frame.

Commissioner Rettman asked if they are planning to procure other properties in this immediate area.

Ms. Carlson said she is not aware of any additional properties that are being acquired.

Commissioner Bennett asked if County staff have looked at the property or done any clean up of the sites.

Kris Kujala, Tax Forfeited Land Section, Property Records and Revenue, said they have not done any type of phase 1 or phase 2 on this stretch of land because of the statutory hold that the HRA put on the properties. Until they came forward with their application to acquire the property there was no type of environmental review of the property.

Commissioner Bennett asked what type of clean up is needed on these properties.

Ms. Carlson said the former owner owned a trucking industry and may have done some dumping on the sites.

Commissioner Bennett said the County doesn't know what the City will do with the property, nor how long it will be held, and has no idea what the development is and we don't know what type of clean up is needed. It would be nice to have the answers to those questions. He asked if it was necessary that this be approved to do today.

Commissioner Rettman said the HRA recently passed the TIER program (Truth in Environment Review) which would do those environmental assessments on tax forfeited properties. If this was laid over, could this be the first property to use the program?

**(Continued)**

Ms. Kujala said staff is just beginning to have meetings to establish the ground rules for the TIER program; regarding funding, it may become an issue, but it could be used as a pilot project and start to investigate doing a phase 1 and phase 2 to see what type of clean up is needed.

Commissioner Ortega asked about the other tax forfeited property in that area.

Ms. Kujala said the other property in the tax forfeited land inventory is north of these lots that are currently on the list. It is a fairly large block of land that has recently come back to the tax forfeited land inventory. It was the former dump site used by the City of St. Paul for street sweepings and snow removal dumping. That site closed in 1995 and is now back on the tax forfeited land inventory.

Commissioner Ortega asked who owned it previously.

Ms. Kujala said it was on a use deed by the City of St. Paul Public Works Department because they were using it to dump the street sweepings onto that site. It has recently been returned because of closure of the site.

Commissioner Ortega moved to lay over these eight items (10.3-10.11), seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Commissioner Rettman asked if the City could do their due diligence and if there have been any environmental assessments done on the property.

Ms. Kujala asked if Board approval would be necessary to do a TIER evaluation of these properties.

Commissioner Rettman asked if the motion to lay over included doing the TIER evaluation.

Commissioner Ortega said his motion was to just get a better sense of what it all entails, given that we now have the property north of these lots. He wants to get a better sense of what is going on in terms of all the properties in that part of the district.

Roll Call to lay over: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0.

#### COUNTY MANAGER – Transitway Impacts Research and Outreach Program

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the draft resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Carter.

Commissioner Rettman referred to the Executive Summary of the documentation and said that a concern that continues to be persistent in the Central Corridor area is the matter of gentrification and concerns about the current affordable housing – the people who are there now and especially with the current situation with foreclosures – and what has happened since 2001. None of that is included in their work study; the only thing that hints of neighborhood is “community cohesion of neighborhoods located along the corridor”. She would like to know who is the lead staff person and would like to make certain that the research would include, but not be limited to, the impacts of gentrification and the loss of small businesses and the people currently in affordable housing and the current residents. Equally, the neighborhood residents and businesses cannot be left out. There is no mention of the impacts that the residents must live with each day in terms of the parking problem along the Corridor. She wants to make certain that the gentrification issue, both in the business community and the small businesses, and jobs lost are included.

In the Snelling/University study, we said the neighborhoods had to be included, but it did not happen. She wants to know who would be held accountable for this study.

Steve Morris, Transit Project Manager, said Tim Mayasich, Director, Regional Railroad Authority, is the lead staff person in Ramsey County’s work with this group. For some time the Center for Transportation Studies has been fairly pure research on the impacts of transitways. To a portion of Commissioner Rettman’s issue, some of the research that has been worked on lately is trying to

*(Continued)*

identify the impacts on housing and business values along the Hiawatha Corridor. It doesn't go as far as what Commissioner Rettman is talking about but they are trying to use the actual statistical data off of Hiawatha to draw some conclusions.

Commissioner Rettman asked "if we add it, will it be done". She would like empirical data on the viability, because it is not the values, it is the people lost and the buildings lost that are not quantified by just a value. Part of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), part of the supplemental EIS, and part of the final EIS talk about these types of things that are drivers. She is trying to be consistent; what we have tried to do is make sure that this is not artificially gentrifying a neighborhood and running out the businesses that we are hoping to keep.

Mr. Morris said the process has to do with what the researchers can identify as issues and projects and ways to approach it. Some of the things Commissioner Rettman has brought up may be more qualitative in nature.

Dawn Spanhake, with the University of Minnesota Center for Transportation Studies, and a manager working on this program, said there is a project management team assigned to this project; all of the partners have representatives on the team. Part of their job is to work with the researchers to identify research needs that are of interest to the University, of interest nationally, and of interest to the local communities, to address these transitway impact questions. There is a mechanism to talk to the Ramsey County staff members who are on those boards so that Ramsey County's needs are known, which can then be made part of the process to identify their research projects.

Commissioner Rettman said her concerns could be drafted by staff to be brought back to the Board to make sure the issues are included, or those issues could possibly be added today.

Commissioner Rettman moved an amendment that the loss of current affordable housing versus new affordable housing, and the gentrification of both businesses and residences be added under the 'impacts that the research program will measure'. Commissioner Carter seconded the motion.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that what Commissioner Rettman would like included as an amendment is not a part of the resolution. The resolution the Board will vote on is whether or not this would be included in the County's federal legislative package. Perhaps two separate motions are needed; the first one would state that it is Ramsey County's position that gentrification of the businesses and residences and the loss of current affordable housing be added under the impact section of what Ramsey County expects them to do.

Chair Parker clarified that this resolution would be direction to staff to include these items in the scope of the project.

Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-093)

WHEREAS, The Transitway Impacts Research and Outreach Program conducts research on transitway impacts that are important to transportation decisions made by the County; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners is supporting a \$1 million request for Federal Funding for the program; and

WHEREAS, The impacts on current residents and businesses are extremely important to the Board of Commissioners; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That it is the position of the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners that the gentrification of the businesses and residences and the loss of current affordable housing be added under the impact section of the research conducted by the University of Minnesota.

*(Continued)*

Roll Call on original draft resolution: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-094)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners has reviewed proposals and initiatives for inclusion in its federal legislative package for the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, That the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby authorizes inclusion of the following item in its federal legislative package for the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress:

- Funding request of \$1 million for the Transitway Impacts Research and Outreach Program

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The County Board further authorizes its representatives to work with members of the Congressional Delegation and other interested parties to seek the necessary legislation for this proposal.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS – Agreements for three Alternatives to Detention Demonstration Programs

Commissioner Carter introduced the draft resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Commissioner Carter said that the Board heard from Corrections staff in a workshop setting about the work they have been doing over the past three years in Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) and that the work has not been solely taken place in Corrections, but that it has been a process of collaboration with departments throughout the County, with the Police Department, schools, courts, and with organizations throughout the community. We recognize quite a bit of success over the past three years since the Corrections Department originally came to the Board requesting assistance for JDAI and have worked in partnership with the Annie E Casey Foundation, the Burns Institute, the Minnesota Department of Public Safety and the Otto Bremer Foundation, which has been a funding partner along with the others. We have been able to reduce the juvenile detention population, that admissions to juvenile detention have been reduced, and a daily population that kept 382 young people out of detention this past year, through the process of the JDAI. Three years ago, the Board asked Corrections to create the evidence- and data-based process and to show the Board the need to identify the young people who could benefit. The Department has done so, but not only have they done the research and shown us the data, they have also accomplished much during that time. They are coming to the Board today to ask for continuation to build upon the accomplishments that have already been realized.

Commissioner Carter said that during the workshop, the Commissioners asked many questions of the Department. She thanked the Board for encouraging the process, along with the people who have worked on it. We have observed that a clear challenge is the reduction of disproportionate minority confinement (DMC). A process of partnership and collaboration has occurred over the past three years, has in a scientific- and data-based process included those communities most affected by that DMC. The effort to develop the community alternatives that are being recommended today, have fully engaged those communities.

Commissioner Reinhardt agreed that the workshop was very informative. She will support this item today. \$1.1 million is a lot of money; it is one-time money. She asked that the County Manager explain where the funds would be coming from. That fact that it is one-time money is one of the reasons why this should be moved forward. The reason it is one-time money is that if these

**(Continued)**

alternatives work, they would be able to close another pod in the Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) which would have savings to the County. The fact that this is evidence- and research-based is also important; if we can stop youth from getting involved in law enforcement to begin with through functional family therapy, ART, ACE, etc., it will ultimately save a tremendous amount of taxpayer money. The idea behind JDAI is that those kids that need to be incarcerated for whatever reason, are incarcerated; those who do not need to be incarcerated at a much higher cost, are not. We do not ignore the social impact of the harm that can be done if the child is incarcerated and should not be, but also what it does to the families. There is a ripple effect. Whatever we can do to keep our kids out of jail and out of trouble, and to make sure they are handled appropriately if there is a run-in with the law, so that we don't make matters worse. The documentation talks about the one-time transfer of money. That means we are saying we believe in this and need to have these alternatives to change the lives of many young people in Ramsey County and for the betterment of our society, and that we believe we will not need additional on-going funding because we are going to save money in other areas. That is why it is a pilot project. When this was previously before the Board, she talked about the second year going into the two-year budget process, as she assumed they would need on-going funding after the second year. Because this is set up to say that either we succeed and save the money, or try something else, it is not meant to be on-going funding, and is the reason she believes it is important to pass it right now. The reality is that we invest this money and if it works we will save this money many times over and we do not need to add to the budget to have these positive impacts. She is supportive of this. This is long-term systemic change.

Commissioner Rettman has concerns; first of all, it uses one-time money that comes from fund balance, when just moments from now we will hear the new state forecast. We need to look at all programs. There has been no RFP and has not given an opportunity for others to bid on it. It does not make the internal changes that we have always talked about. This has been a pilot project for the past two years. There were no written proposals submitted as part of the Board packet. There was no review of the programs. We have a history of doing RFPs for these types of things. There are no goals except what is listed in the narrative of the Executive Summary. Model Cities has already announced in their newsletter that they have the money. She believes this precludes other community based organizations from submitting a RFP and us saying what we want the deliverables to be. Therefore she questions the wisdom of this coming to the Board outside the budget process. She would like to entertain this as part of the budget process, but doesn't believe this is a one-time use of funding. The County Manager's comments state that if it works, an RFP will be distributed in 2011. She believes that if other things require a RFP process and to compete, we need to do the same with this and give all community based facilities an opportunity to bid on it.

Carol Roberts, Director, Community Corrections, said the Department has been working on JDAI and DMC for approximately three years. They have not been dealing with alternatives to detention until this point in time. Up to now, they have been dealing with children coming into the detention center who could be released to kinship. The data shows that children can successfully be released, and that the outcomes they seek can be achieved. About one year ago, they began looking at alternatives to detention. They were guided by the Annie E Casey Foundation and the Burns Institute around the issue of DMC. Her preference is to always do an RFP – it is about the cleanest process one can have. The DMC may require something a bit different, which is the recommendation of the Burns Institute, which is a national organization working with localities, such as Ramsey County, to look at the work of DMC. The philosophy is to turn to the communities where most of the kids are coming from and where the disproportionate minority issues are going on. In Ramsey County there are two major areas – Frogtown and the Eastside. The strategy is not a clean process but is rather a messy process because it involves human beings in all areas in the community and juvenile justice system. Basically, we have

*(Continued)*

gone out to the communities, Burns Institute has done focus groups and community coachups. Various committees working with JDAI have gone out to do focus groups. One of the main suggestions and the philosophy of the Burns Institute is that you go to the community where the issue exists – you categorize all the community based organizations in that community that have the potential to do the work we are asking them to do. That took place. Those folks were invited to come together and dialogue with the County and various stakeholders who were in charge of looking at alternatives. It is through that organic process of working directly with the community and community agencies and with families, that the community organizations, in conversation among themselves and with the County, were able to separate out who could do the work we are asking them to do. There are some community partners that left the table saying they were not ready to do that work, nor were they equipped to provide the needed services. There are some who left the table and said they could not do the services but they were interested in staying at the table to participate in the conversation. Out of a year's worth of work dealing directly at the grass roots level in the community, a group of organizations came forward stating that they could do what the County was asking for. It is not the typical governmental process, because we were looking for a different type of result. It is recognized that if the Board were to approve the proposal today, we need to work with those agencies in a much different way than in the past. We have to be out there in a way we have not been before to make sure that these things work because it is a mutual accountability. It is working in a way that we are not used to working in government. We have had systems change in the way the courts operate and in the way Corrections operates. Processes have been changed. This period of time would give time to experiment and to see what can be done; that is why it is a demonstration project. We intend to be successful – and if so, more things would have to change, particularly in the Corrections Department.

Commissioner Ortega conceptually agrees with how this needs to move; his biggest fear is that we tend to not have these become a part of the ongoing structure but have them on the side. If we hit a huge economic crisis this could be gone in two years. Assuming that this is successful, what would come down in Corrections to make up for the dollars?

Ms. Roberts said the first thing would be to identify what else could come down at the Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) and would mean that more pods would be closed. That money would be used to fund alternatives.

Commissioner Ortega asked if there was a sense as to where the books would balance.

Ms. Roberts said the alternative programs will cost approximately \$550,000 annually, so they would have to see if the reductions could be made at the JDC and in the placement budget.

Commissioner Ortega asked about the evaluation component and who would administer that component.

Ms. Roberts said the Corrections Department would be responsible for that. The primary outcomes include, that for those kids who would normally be brought into the detention center, but would now be released to alternatives, we would want to know that they would be coming back to court, and that they are not getting arrested during the pendency of their court case. That is what detention is for; it is for those kids who we believe will not come back to court and for those who would get re-arrested during the pendency of their case. Likewise, for kids already on probation, we would look to see that we don't increase our placements but that the placements are decreased.

Commissioner Ortega said that the basis is not whether the program is a good one, but looking at budgetary issues. If the economic situation gets worse, more than ever we will need programs that work. If we don't look ahead at how we would balance the budget or supplant part of an antiquated system with one that works, that is the magic. He has seen and heard of many programs that have

*(Continued)*

given good results, but they have not been institutionalized. We are looking at spending a great deal of money at Boys Totem Town; now, he is hearing that perhaps we don't need some changes. That has a fiscal impact on what is spent in another part of the budget.

Commissioner McDonough is concerned about the budget piece and the forecast that will be released today. Also, he contacted a couple of the organizations that are listed as being at the table. Both organizations do not support it because there should be an RFP. He believes that one red flag is that the DMC numbers rose dramatically. The goal is to have the numbers go the other way. The documentation addresses pre-and post-disposition youth. He was contacted by a probation officer (PO) who said there are POs who go into schools and pull the kids out. Perhaps there should be a change in how POs do their work – possibly work at night. He has too many questions about the accountability and how we are setting ourselves up for the systems change. Some of the feedback he has received from people listed as community members was that they felt the drive to get to an end point was so strong that the willingness of this group to listen to other conversations was not heard. One of the groups said they would never recommend that this happen without an RFP process. The Board just went through the whole MFIP thing, and just talked about the policy on concentration of poverty and how the policies are established but are not adhered to. We continue to move away from them. One of the strongest things we have had is how pure the RFP process has to be so there is no illusion by anyone in the community that someone is getting an "in" because of who they know or which table they are sitting at. He is not ready to support this today as there are many questions that need to be answered. He wants a better sense of the conversations that have occurred about why we can't make changes in our current probation system and why we are so willing to take two years to look at how this might work. He is not willing to support this at this time.

Ms. Roberts said she has participated in some of the community meetings. Others have said that we have not moved fast enough and that there is a sense of urgency about this.

Commissioner McDonough said that feedback had been received from people who sat at the table. There is so much aggression about not moving fast enough that no one is taking enough time to thoroughly have the conversations. When other things are brought up they are pushed forward because there is a group in this community that is so impatient for something to happen here.

Ms. Roberts said there is a sizeable group of people on the other side of that equation. She believes there has been a great deal of talking about this issue, in a variety of venues. She believes POs should be out at night, and many of them are. The alternatives are about a place in a community where kids are worked with for several hours during the evening. There is no way that POs can devote themselves to that and manage the case loads they have and manage the court they have to manage. That is not one of the places she would look to have a change that would impact this particular area. Where she would look to make a change is in the institutions, particularly the JDC. In a two year period, things can internally be moved around. The system has modified the way it operates. There has been a cultural change for the courts, corrections, and the JDC. Generally, if a PO pulled a kid out of school it would be because there was something going on, for example drug use. She believes in RFPs and agrees that this is messy because there are so many conversations taking place with people in the community. This has been an inclusive process and people were given many opportunities to say what they needed to say. She believes that she and her staff have made one of the more significant efforts in Ramsey County to deal with some very tough issues that often people don't want to face.

Commissioner McDonough asked if these are kids that rated too high on the assessment to be let go. What is the tool that determines that their risk was too high to just be released back into the community?

*(Continued)*

Ms. Roberts said there is a Risk Assessment Committee; they, with the help of Annie E Casey Foundation, developed a Risk Assessment tool. It divides the population into three parts: 1) 0-9 are kids who can be released to kinship, which is primarily what has been done; 2) the mid-range kids who could be released to the community but need some sort of supervision protocol while they are going through their court case. There are already some traditional alternatives in place such as shelters and electronic home monitoring. So far, these kids have had zero recidivism. Those are the pre-disposition kids. For the post-disposition kids – they are kids already under supervision and are showing signs of failing. The reaction in the past would have been to have these kids placed in detention. The federal government has come out with a new report stating that these kinds of kids need to stay out of detention. Therefore, a variety of alternatives are needed for POs to avoid deeper penetration in the system, whether it is JDC or an out-of-home placement. They have worked with a national consultant on the post-dispositional cases to create a grid to look at probationer's risk levels and the kind of misbehavior with which they have been involved, and to have a series of alternatives from which to pick. In the past a PO could determine the kid's outcome which could be very different. This approach says that similarly placed kids representing the same kind of risk level and the same kind of behavior should be similarly treated.

Commissioner McDonough brought up his interpretation that the DMC numbers are going the wrong way.

Ms. Roberts said that is expected and is a national trend of what happens. They have a DMC committee, chaired by Judge George Stephenson and Sarah Walker from 180 Degrees. One of the Burns Institute founding principles in doing this work is that they believe that when you engage natural communities in coming up with solutions in collaboration with government, where the solution comes from the community, when they are the ones doing the work with corrections, that that has an impact on DMC. In this case, she trusts the consultants. She knows what the national data looks like.

Peter Jessen-Howard, Assistant Director, Juvenile Division, said that the percentages are very difficult to come down. The actual numbers have come down considerably. They have been effective in reducing the number of youth of color, and all youth, into detention. Supporting this supports the change they are seeking. If this is not approved, he believes it will be a big step backward and would be difficult to maintain the momentum with the community and would be difficult to keep these numbers down. Additionally, the budgets, in placements and detention, would likely increase.

Commissioner McDonough said that over the past three years the County was engaged in the Building Lives program. The grant funding went away and no one has been able to come up the funding. All of a sudden we can find over \$1 million for this.

Ms. Roberts said that at the end of 2008, the Corrections Department had expended dollars in its budget and some unappropriated excess revenue that came in, which went to fund balance, and would go a long way to paying for this effort.

Commissioner Carter has appreciated the comments made by Commissioners and the Department. We are here three years after having an initial discussion and have dramatically reduced the population in the detention centers because of good judgment. Keeping juveniles out of detention have made all communities safer. Because the numbers of young people who come to us have been reduced for treatment and detention dollars have been saved through this system change initiative. This year alone considerable dollars have been saved because of the number of juveniles we have been able to keep out of detention. The number of kids kept out of detention is 382. Making a change in people's lives and a systemic and evidence-based best practices way, is a challenge. In various locations around the country we have seen the engagement of communities with corrections and the partnering that has happened. Research and best practices says that when you engage those most affected you get the most effective solutions. That has been what we have been doing. Corrections

*(Continued)*

has reported its progress each year. In 2009, the focus of DMC, based upon the data and evidence, provides the greatest opportunity for us. These community alternatives, working with the most affected communities, guarantee that we will solidify the partnership and holding each other accountable for the results that we seek. We are seeking to reduce the number of juveniles in detention and seeking to reduce the disproportionality and want to make certain that these juveniles show up in court and that they don't re-offend. We want to make certain that we track that system change and the savings in detention. Over the past three years, we have made changes. In the workshop, she heard Commissioner Rettman say that some of this work should be done in the community by volunteers who step up to the plate to do this work. She agrees. Corrections, the County Attorney, court, police, schools and community organizations have been working together and as volunteers. The announcement in the Model Cities newsletter does not surprise her because they have been working with the County and are deeply involved. They have been engaged in building this and making it a reality even before the funding occurs. That is the strength of the collaboration. She is pleased that the community has stepped up to the plate and is doing this work. She encouraged the Commissioners to support this as the evidence and need have been heard. For us to delay movement through this process would be to deny the great work that has been done over this long period of waiting.

Commissioner Bennett asked why this could not come up during the budget process.

Ms. Roberts said these alternatives could be provided in the community right now. There are kids in detention that would not be there if these alternatives were in place. That creates its own kind of momentum. She believes that a delay is not a good thing, but it needs to get up and running and done.

Commissioner Bennett asked why an RFP was not done.

Ms. Roberts said they have worked with people whose business is to do the work of DMC across the country. Their best advice in this for moving this type of effort forward was to not do an RFP – it is to get the communities where this disproportionality exists and for them to do the work with the guidance with the justice system. That is what has happened here. We told them the kinds of things that we would be looking to put in place – and that came out of the work of an alternatives and detention committee, made up of people from across the system. They came together with us as a group but mostly working among themselves to identify the partners who were interested and have the ability to do these alternatives.

Ms. Roberts said the “rush” may have been caused by her at the end of last year when she was trying to get a handle on the dollars and thinking that it might get before the Board before the last meeting of 2008. In getting the details together she did put a push on it at the end of the year.

Ms. Roberts said that if DMC were to be impacted, this would be one of the best ways to do it.

Commissioner Bennett said he doesn't want to vote against this program but his problems are around the budget. When this project started, we did not have the financial situation we have at this time. The County Manager will likely have to come as close to a zero tax levy increase as possible. Here we would take \$1.1 million out of the general fund. Perhaps we could not do so much at Boys Totem Town. Perhaps this is a stronger program than ACE.

Commissioner Bennett said it might be wise to move this proposal into the budget cycle. This has had a good hearing and he would rather lay it over than vote it down. He would not like to vote against it but put it up against the other programs. Cuts will have to be made. He asked County Manager Kleinschmidt if enough money was left over from all the departments to cover the \$4.3 M the County had to absorb from the State.

Ms. Kleinschmidt said the County is going through the audit now and has not formally closed the books, but there is sufficient fund balance.

Commissioner Bennett asked what would happen if this was laid over until the budget process in July and August. Ms. Roberts said one part of that answer is that there would be kids held because the alternatives would not be in place.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Bennett asked if that portion could be funded out of the Corrections Department budget today. Ms. Roberts responded negatively.

Commissioner Bennett asked if there was a project within the Department that would be lower than this one. Ms. Roberts said she did not know how she could argue with something that deals with social justice, which is what this is about.

Commissioner Bennett said that is his dilemma. This will be a tough budget cycle. It would be very hard to raise property taxes. This would be for \$1.1 M. He would like to see the project go ahead but would like to see the budget as close to zero as can be. He could not make the determination today, and by voting for this, we would be locking it in.

Commissioner Reinhardt, as Budget Chair, said she spent a lot of time going over this proposal, where the money would come from, whether it would be in competition, to figure out whether or not it was better to go into the next budget cycle. This is one-time funding. The idea is that the work doesn't go away, but that there would be enough savings from the positive impact of this that there would be an offset. The work would not stop, but we would be able to cover the costs because there would not be as many kids in the JDC -- only those kids that really need to be there, with others in alternatives, and those who are adjudicated to Boys Totem Town would come into play. She does not view this as being in competition with the other things we are doing. Building Lives is important; ACE and Functional Family Therapy, and ART are all important components because they are all going in the direction of prevention and rehabilitation, and coming up with the best societal impacts, as well as the best impact on our bottom line for taxpayers because it is very costly when talking about out-of-home placement. Just from the pure economic standpoint, these are incredibly costly things to do, not to mention the societal impacts.

Commissioner Reinhardt said we have been waiting for three years. If it goes into the next budget cycle, it doesn't go in until 2010. There is enough information; she is comfortable with what the County Manager has described to her as a sustainable way of making sure that we are doing the best possible thing we can for these kids, whether it is preventing them from having contact with law enforcement or giving them alternatives once they have gotten into trouble, or if they need to be incarcerated, the rehabilitation to find them jobs and get them back into the community. These are all parts of the continuum. The more up-front we can get with this, the better, but this is one component that isn't being addressed right now. The timing is now; it is important to our bottom line, and in these critical resource-driven times, we need to save as much as we can, as soon as we possibly can. That means an up-front expenditure. The research that has been done will make this sustainable, and we will realize the return on investment in two years. We need to go forward with this now. We need to save these kids and we need to save money.

Commissioner Carter said we make our decisions based on doing what is best, utilizing the resources we have at the point in time. That point in time for the juveniles we are talking about and for our County, for the families, for the health of our entire County is now. We haven't talked much about the harm that is done. We have a wonderful Community Corrections staff. Our goal is that when juveniles come to us, they will leave us better. We don't know that our goal is always accomplished, but we do know that the research shows that the single greatest predictor of a life of crime is whether or not a juvenile has spent a day in detention. For her that is a stark representation of the urgency, and we have been active for awhile proving beyond doubt that we can keep juveniles out of detention, that there are better places for them to be to manage their risk and to address their needs. This is not a competition. This is about a continuum. At every point along the journey, we have to make certain that we are appropriately addressing that need and risk. This is a part of that. It is also a part of making certain that we use those dollars wisely because this is an expensive treatment, one that we can avoid. We can create these alternatives, we know what they will be, and we know that they are less costly,

*(Continued)*

and that we are creating taxpayers who will add to our base to address all of the needs within our community, and not long-term criminals. The urgency is to move forward today.

Commissioner McDonough said he is not certain that Commissioner Bennett's question was answered. He thought the question was whether there is enough money left over from 2008 in all the budgets to deal with the unallocated dollars. County Manager Kleinschmidt's response was 'there is enough in fund balance'. He did not believe there was enough left over in the 2008 budget to cover that unallocation. Is that correct?

Ms. Kleinschmidt said the books have not been closed.

Commissioner McDonough said it doesn't look like there is enough left over if all the budgets add up to the unallocation; there are going to have to be other adjustments. Staff will not have to come back to the Board, but the leftovers in the department budgets are not going to be enough to cover that gap.

Ms. Kleinschmidt believed that there would be a sufficiency among all of the County budgets that would cover both the unallotment and this \$1.1 M.

Commissioner McDonough requested clarification that the County's fund balance would not drop below the policy of the County Board by doing this.

Ms. Kleinschmidt said she believes that when the books are finally closed for December 31, 2008, we will have achieved our 7.5%.

Commissioner McDonough asked if it is the goal with the recommendation to utilize the dollars being talked about, not to lower the 7.5% for 2009 or 2010 to do this.

Ms. Kleinschmidt responded affirmatively. She is not recommending dipping into or below the 7.5% in order to pay for this.

Commissioner McDonough said it would take \$1.1 M out of competition for all the reductions. We would be making a decision now for 2009 and 2010 for \$1.1 M, and they are not going to have to compete with anything else as far as budget reductions.

Ms. Kleinschmidt said she would characterize this as not necessarily for budget reductions but for the use of one-time funds.

Commissioner McDonough said as a part of the presentation in the Workshop, it is his understanding from the earlier reductions that were accomplished through the assessment, that the department has already closed at least one pod.

Ms. Roberts said Corrections went down four positions for approximately \$260,000.

Commissioner McDonough said he recalled the amount was \$275,000, which was returned to the general budget and not utilized within Corrections when that reduction occurred. Ms. Roberts responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Bennett said reference has been made to two different terms of one-time money. What is meant by one-time money? One-time money for the County has normally meant money that came in over and above from sale of property or some other source. This is one-time expenditure of money; it is not one-time money into the general fund.

Ms. Kleinschmidt said once the revenue or the unexpended appropriations are in the fund balance, we now refer to that as one-time money. The Board's policy is that once the money is in fund balance, not to spend it on on-going operations, but on one-time things.

Commissioner Bennett used the housing money as an example. There is \$2.5 M sitting there. That is one-time money that came in and it could be one-time money going out. This is one-time money going out.

Commissioner Rettman said she respectfully disagreed with County Manager Kleinschmidt. Regarding a delay, all that is being suggested is that it be a part of the budget process. She supports that because it would be hard to get four votes to cut anything because there are always going to be

*(Continued)*

issues to deal with. With this \$1.1 M, other departments could come in to say they closed it to fund balance, and now get to extract it for one-time only. The County hasn't funded the Other Post-Employment Benefits (OPEB) responsibility; we have enormous responsibility to our unfunded liability. There are huge issues to be dealt with in 2010-2011. Anybody who works for the County knows about the budget process.

Commissioner Rettman said she would still have a problem if Ms. Roberts were to come in to say she would cut something in her budget to fund this, because why not a Request for Proposals (RFP). What is the Department so afraid of that these folks wouldn't be able to do it? The beauty in competing with others is that a passionate group could put forth an RFP just the same as anyone else, and be able to do exactly what it is. It would, however, always make sure that the RFP process would have a group that is impartial to determine those things. There was no proposal given. This gives the authorization to the County Manager to do those proposals but they probably exist in some shape, form, or the other, but they were not a part of this.

A layover would put this in the budget process; it could go as fast or slow as the Board would want it to go; but the reality is, when we close to fund balance, we still have to fund OPEB which we did not fund as much as has been done in previous years. This takes the \$1.1 M out. Corrections should do it within their budget until the budget process begins. She would support a layover to go through the budget process. That way the Board would not be voting against it today, but at least keep it in-play, and by that time, an RFP could be out the door.

Commissioner Ortega said he is supportive of the program. His main concern is that this program would be successful, and we need to make an institutional change in the Corrections Department. Commissioner McDonough's example of Building Lives was a good one. The County has good programs with the same goals as those of this program, and we have let them go. He would not like to see that happen two years from now. What is not in the documentation is how to make that transition over the next two years to make sure it becomes part of the Corrections Department. He would want that on paper, to be able to hold the Department accountable two years from now, to say why this program isn't being institutionalized in our structure as the way we do business. It is a good program, but we have had good programs come and go. He does not want to have that verbalized but in writing to see where, how many pods, how much money, how do we expand the program if it is successful, how do we triple the number of kids, not double it, how do we save. We are talking about saving 100 kids now; if this is successful, how do we save 1,000 kids in two years. There is no crystal ball, we don't know what the economy is going to be, but there has to be a plan, a vision, besides that which has been the last two years, which he applauds and supports. That is missing here.

Commissioner Ortega said another concern for him is the RFP process. The Board just went through the MFIP proposal. He heard from the African American community about how messy that process was. He has heard from folks since the last presentation that this has to be an open process – that came from the African American community, not the Hispanic, not any other community. He has questions about that. We are using different methodologies, and might have to do business differently.

Addressing Ms. Roberts, Commissioner Ortega said it was her job to come to the Board to say a policy discussion would be needed. He asked Chair Parker to add that to the list, as item two for policy discussion. He would have four-five other things for policy discussion. What is the RFP process that we are telling all communities that they have to abide by? Do we want to change it, fine, but it doesn't change after the fact. A policy discussion could have been held last week and then made a decision. He is supportive of the program. There are budget issues and he shares the consensus of the Board, but he is not as rigid on that piece. Bottom-line so far, Ramsey County hasn't asked for 20% cuts across the board from every department, and there is a reason for that, which is that Ramsey County

*(Continued)*

has been fiscally prudent, while we read that other local governments are asking for huge cuts. He weighs that in the balance. He is now saying to lay this over to the budget process, but it might make sense to lay it over to put the whole picture together in a way that makes more sense for the majority of the County Board.

Commissioner Reinhardt offered some alternative language in draft resolution: “Resolved, upon completion of the pilot program that appropriate alternatives be incorporated into the Corrections system through an RFP process; and Be It Further Resolved, The Board directs staff to provide quarterly updates to the Board on these alternatives.” We need to know if the program is working. We would be doing this because we believe it should be part of a systems change that could be expanded if needed, but done through an RFP process.

Commissioner Ortega said that RFP process would be done down the line.

Commissioner Reinhardt responded affirmatively. After the completion, we would know what the appropriate alternatives should be.

Commissioner Ortega said he had seconded the motion, and the language would be fine to him, but it doesn't answer the question of the RFP process now. People he has spoken with have made it clear to him that this should have an RFP process. On the MFIP proposal, his vote was consistent since November 2008, which was strictly on the policy that is in place. Those were hard votes, involving a lot of his constituents, but there have to be rules that the Board makes a good effort to follow.

Commissioner Carter agreed that there have to be rules and policies that the Board gives a good effort to follow. She has heard the question on the RFP process and the response from the Director of Community Corrections, and understands the responses. The Board could talk about a whole list of things missing here. The Board ought to give direction for some of those critical components to be included and she would support an amendment if that were offered to develop the continuum and to clarify that in writing how this would be incorporated in the system change, and to find ways to expand the impact of this initiative if voted up today. She also appreciated the need for quarterly updates in that consistent reporting.

Commissioner Carter said we hear about the community frequently as we talk about these kinds of changes. In this discussion, we are talking about an impacted community driven here because of the disproportionate minority contact and confinement and doing the research over the past three years. The Corrections Department has consistently come to the Board to share the disproportionality of children of color, specifically African American children. This work has been done with that community with a real focus on engaging the impacted community, developing the solutions, and in taking responsibility together with Ramsey County for doing things very differently than we have in the past. This is not an easy objective. To reduce this disproportionate minority confinement is a challenge throughout our nation, and it is a challenge if we are going to reduce disparity, if we are going to make a difference as our population changes, in the results we see in Ramsey County, we must take on as a Board. We are not shrinking from that responsibility. We know we are going to hear some favorable responses for any solution put forth, and we would hear some that are in disagreement for any solution in any area that we talk about. The same is true here. There may be some people who have not been able to agree with the method in which this is moving forward, but the overwhelming input Commissioner Carter has received from the community has been positive from all factions of the community, whether we are looking at our partners in systems or our community, in particular if we are talking about the African American community.

Commissioner Carter recognized and respects the views of the Commissioners, for the time to talk through this. She requested that Nathaniel Khaliq, President of the St. Paul Branch of the NAACP, to share his perspective of the African American community as he knows it.

***(Continued)***

Chair Parker allowed Mr. Khaliq to provide a brief comment.

Commissioner Reinhardt as seconder of the motion, considered her amendment as friendly.

Commissioner Carter as maker of the motion considered the amendment as friendly.

Mr. Khaliq said he is a lifelong resident of the Summit-University area. He thanked the Commissioners for tackling this issue. The City is talking about closing recreation centers; where will these kids go, and who will work with them. Many people do not have any faith in these studies. With the creative minds at work, a solution can be found for what we are seeking today. No one wants to violate the rules, but to modify them. There is crisis in the community. Many people intervening on behalf of the total community to stop the bad activity don't have anything to offer them; it can't be done alone by talking about faith and moral authority. The safety nets today have gaping holes. JDAI had been seen as another way to waste money to study somebody. There are experts in the community, experts in the Department, and he encouraged the Board to come up with a solution short of the 2010 funding, otherwise, something drastic will have to be done in the community to shape things up. Yes, there is a budget crisis, but some creative solution can be found to establish a meaningful partnership, not a piecemeal partnership, to work on the solution. At the end of two years, if this program is successful, the County, City, State and Feds will line up to keep it going because it is in everybody's best interest. St. Paul has had some difficult issues over the years, but only when we have established partnerships based on mutual trust and respect.

Commissioner Bennett said he does not want to put another hole out there by committing this money today. The Board has to make a lot of decisions as the budget comes forward. He is not trying to put this off into the next budget cycle. He suggested this be looked at after the County Manager's budget is proposed in September. Looking at one item at a time, we wouldn't be able to afford the budget. He asked to be recognized at the end of the discussion for a possible motion.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the amendment has been accepted as friendly.

Commissioner McDonough said he has been asked how he would vote. He has received phone calls from community members on concerns about what is being presented. He has been as tough as any of the Commissioners about this is institutionalized, how we help build a silo outside what we are doing, how we make real change, that this becomes a part of what we do, whether it is in Courts, law enforcement, Corrections, or somewhere in the community. As a bigger picture, he has probably advocated as much as anybody on the Board for the Department Heads to step up and find ways to be creative in solving problems. He has expressed frustration with things that work but we are never willing to pull something out – just to pile on. He pointed out his frustration earlier today with Building Lives -- the grant funding went away and no one has the ability to fund it. He has watched these things come and go during his tenure on the Board.

Commissioner McDonough said his concerns haven't changed on how pure our process is on the RFP policy and the message sent to the community; his concerns about the budget and how the Board is being asked today to make a decision on \$1.1 M before we have any sense of where we are going to be at – that is a big request – there are a lot of big requests in this. He is trying to figure out where he will fall on this, to challenge himself and others to continue to look at how this is being presented. He continues to push those in the County Manager's position to engage the Departments to be creative. His role is to be supportive of those efforts, or stifling when asking management what to do in the County. For the position he takes and the rigidity, how to stay pure to the RFP process, how to send a message to the community that this isn't just a good old boys club getting all the contracts. Having brought up the whole issue of the Small Business Enterprise group and all the issues about how we do our contracts, this is a part of that; the process needs to be fair. He would not be a part of stifling or inhibiting what he has asked the County Manager and Department Heads to do.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner McDonough said he would move forward with supporting this today, but there will be no one who doesn't expect results. Quarterly reports have to be a part of this, and the questions that will come forward on those reports are going to be tough questions. A part of that process will have to be the strategy on how we institutionalize not only the funding but the policy on how we behave, how our employees behave, the reactions, and how we interact with all the people we have talked about that are brought to the table. In the end, he believes everybody understands that what we are trying to do here is on the disproportionate amount of minorities that come into our Corrections system, whether in the juvenile system or the adult system, is because of behavior, and decisions being made. We can protect and work around that behavior and try to get different results, but until we change the behavior, which is the piece he is most concerned about, especially in Corrections, the behavior about what we do here, we haven't accomplished making a change in our community about how we treat our citizens.

Chair Parker said she is going to support the recommendation before the Board. This is an opportunity to live by what we have been saying for several years. We want the Departments to look differently at how we do business, to do the kind of system change that is not moving around the boxes but to make a difference in the outcomes. The outcomes we've seen already have been exciting and encouraging that we're moving in the right direction. She also has a concern on the RFP that this is different than how we usually do business. The fact that this was a work in process; we had to work with the community to figure out what we had to create that is not there already, which is a unique situation. Making an exception to the County's normal RFP process is warranted. It is also important to understand that this is going to continue to evolve; that we are learning as we go, and this is a continuous improvement process that we will be learning from the providers. She would not be surprised if the Department comes back stating that changes are needed based on what has been learned throughout the process. The quarterly update is a good idea. By the time the RFP is done, this might look totally different than it would have at this time. She commended staff for working hard with all the stakeholders. It has been a difficult three-year process. She commended Commissioner Carter for taking this problem to heart and for having researched what has been happening throughout the country to figure out how we could change our system to do something that will be more effective, that will work better for our kids.

Commissioner Ortega said he would push for a policy workshop as soon as possible on the RFP process. Equally important, we are just looking at one piece of the picture, an important piece, but in the many years he has been chairing and championing contracting and purchasing for minority businesses in the RFP process, the level playing field is equally important, and there are mixed messages. He has always supported this program, but disagrees, because the RFP process could have been taken up last week. We could have made the exception last week. He feels he is giving out mixed messages when dealing with one sector of the people of color community and saying we are going to fix this and these are the rules, and then on the other side, we make exceptions. He doesn't mind exceptions, he is not rigid, but he does like doing things in the proper order. He wanted to make that point because it is critically important in our other work of the County.

Commissioner Rettman said she would not support this. The County's RFP process would have been an inclusive process, which is lacking here. The County has innumerable programs that have done certain things to different folks. If Ms. Roberts had come in asking for a specified amount of money to go out to continue the work being done now, and that she had found a place to cut it, and to go out for an RFP, we would not be in this situation; \$436,000 would have taken the program through the rest of 2009. Instead, we have a history of Powderhorn coming in two-three years ago getting a \$1 M contract; recently MFIP came in for money; and now this program, where people from the same community are being excluded from the ability to compete. To her, that is not the inclusion that she

*(Continued)*

believes this Board has always stood for, to make sure that everyone has a transparent way to effectively compete for County dollars. This discussion is going to come up during the budget process, and every one of us is going to be called upon for what they are willing to cut. The challenge the County Manager had given every department was to find cuts within their budgets, not to go outside that budget. Transparency to compete is tantamount to good government.

Commissioner Bennett said the Corrections Department did a good job by having money left at the end of the year, and he would not have had a problem in using that to extend this to the end of the year; his concern is about the RFP. There may have been programs that should be eliminated for the next two-year budget. This would go 15 months into the next year's biennium, 9 months this year, not allowing everything to be on the table in true competition. As much as he likes this program, a lot of damage has been done to our process. He agreed that a workshop is needed about the policy because this is not the way to do business.

Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Parker – 5. Nays – Rettman, Bennett – 2. (2009-095)

WHEREAS, The Community Coaches and Evening Learning Center alternatives have been recommended by community and systems stakeholders to provide a meaningful alternative for youth who are accused of committing an offense and are awaiting trial or are struggling to complete probation; and

WHEREAS, These demonstration projects follow the guiding principles established by Ramsey County stakeholders engaged in juvenile justice reform using core strategies created by the Annie E. Casey Foundation as part of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI); and

WHEREAS, The Department will partner with community-based organizations to pilot three alternatives to detention programs designed to reduce the over-reliance of secure detention for youth who do not pose a risk to public safety and/or a risk for not appearing at their next court hearing; and

WHEREAS, A one-time \$1,100,000 transfer from the General County fund balance to the Community Corrections budget is being requested to fund the Community Coaches and Evening Learning Center alternatives; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the one-time transfer of \$1,100,000 from the General County fund balance into a project budget for the purpose of funding the Community Coaches and Evening Learning Center alternatives; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to approve an Agreement with Model Cities, 839 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104, in an amount not to exceed \$281,356, for the period April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2011, in a form to be approved by the County Attorney, for carrying out the initiatives of the Community Coaches alternative; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to approve an Agreement with Model Cities, 839 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104, in an amount not to exceed \$300,463, for the period April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2011, in a form to be approved by the County Attorney, for carrying out the Evening Learning Center; and Be It Further

*(Continued)*

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to approve an Agreement with 180 Degrees, 236 Clifton Avenue, Minneapolis, MN 55403, for services to be provided at Cultural Wellness Center, 965 Payne Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, St. Paul, MN 55106, in an amount not to exceed \$518,181, for the period April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2011, in a form to be approved by the County Attorney for carrying out the Evening Learning Center; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to execute the Agreements and any necessary amendments to the Agreements, in a form to be approved by the County Attorney; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to make any necessary budget adjustments; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board directs County staff to return to the County Board with results of the Alternative to Detention Demonstration Programs; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, Upon completion of the pilot program, that appropriate alternatives be incorporated into the Corrections system through an RFP process; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board directs staff to provide quarterly updates to the Board on these alternatives.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Ordinance Approving 2009 Capital Improvement Bonds

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following ordinance and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Ortega. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-096)

OFFICIAL SUMMARY OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED \$6,100,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS OF 2009

This ordinance authorizes the issuance of bonds in an amount not to exceed \$6,100,000 for 2009 capital improvement needs.

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-096

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED \$6,100,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS OF 2009

- A. WHEREAS, since 1989, Ramsey County, Minnesota (the "County"), has issued bonds to finance capital improvements identified in a capital improvement plan developed with citizen participation; and
- B. WHEREAS, the Home Rule Charter of the County (the "Home Rule Charter") is a desirable source of authority for the issuance of such bonds; and
- C. WHEREAS, the County's adopted capital improvement budget for 2009 contemplates undertaking capital improvements costing over \$33,300,068, financed in part by bonds in an estimated amount of \$6,100,000:

*(Continued)*

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF RAMSEY DOES ORDAIN as follows:

1. Authorization of Bonds - The bonding and borrowing of money by the issuance of not to exceed \$6,100,000 general obligation bonds in 2009 (the "Bonds") is hereby authorized to finance (1) the costs of improvements set forth in the 2009 capital improvement budget of the County, and (2) the costs of any other improvements set forth in the County's capital improvement budgets of any year, to the extent proceeds of the Bonds are not expended on improvements set forth in the 2009 capital improvement budget due to changes occurring after the issuance of the Bonds.
2. Bonding Procedure and Terms - The Bonds shall be scheduled for sale and awarded for sale by resolutions. The specific amount, maturities, interest rates and other terms and conditions of the Bonds and covenants with respect to the Bonds shall be set or made by resolution.
3. Taxes - The Bonds shall be general obligations to which the full faith and credit and taxing powers of the County are pledged. The Bonds shall be paid from ad valorem taxes levied on all taxable property in the County and collected with other taxes, provided that the Bonds may also be paid from interest earnings on the debt service account, and from any other moneys appropriated by the County Board. The taxes levied for the payment of the Bonds shall not limit or reduce the ability of the County to levy taxes for the payment of the costs of other capital improvements or obligations issued to finance the payment of such costs.
4. Authorization of Refunding Bonds - The bonding or borrowing of money by the issuance of bonds or other obligations to refund the Bonds is hereby authorized on the same basis as set forth in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Ordinance No. 93-292, authorizing the refunding of bonds issued prior to November 6, 1992. Further proceedings to schedule such refunding bonds for sale, to set the terms and conditions thereof, to make covenants with respect thereto and to award the sale thereof may be, and are hereby authorized to be, done or taken by resolution.
5. Referendum Upon Petition - This ordinance is subject to the ordinance procedure of the County's Home Rule Charter, including the holding of a referendum if a sufficient petition is filed within thirty (30) days after its publication. Among other conditions to be met, a sufficient petition must be signed by registered voters of the County equal in number to ten percent (10%) of those who voted in the County for office of President of the United States in the last general election.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Ordinance Approving 2009 Capital Improvement Bonds

Commissioner Bennett introduced the following ordinance and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 7. Nays – 0. (2009-097)

OFFICIAL SUMMARY OF ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED \$15,950,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION LIBRARY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS OF 2009

This ordinance authorizes the issuance of bonds in an amount not to exceed \$15,950,000 for 2009 capital improvement needs.

(Continued)

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-097

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED \$15,950,000 GENERAL OBLIGATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BONDS OF 2009

- A. WHEREAS, since 1989, Ramsey County, Minnesota (the "County"), has issued bonds to finance capital improvements identified in a capital improvement plan developed with citizen participation; and
- B. WHEREAS, the Home Rule Charter of the County (the "Home Rule Charter") is a desirable source of authority for the issuance of such bonds; and
- C. WHEREAS, the County's adopted capital improvement budget for 2009 contemplates undertaking capital improvements costing over \$17,350,000, financed in part by bonds for library facilities in an estimated amount of \$15,950,000; and
- D. WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners prefers that levies for library bonds be in the same portion of the County which is taxed for library services; and
- E. WHEREAS, under its Home Rule Charter the County has the power and authority to make library bonds payable from taxes on the portion of the County which is taxed for library service:

NOW, THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF RAMSEY DOES ORDAIN as follows:

1. Finding – The Board of Commissioners hereby finds, determines and declares that the Home Rule Charter of the County confers the power and authority to make library bonds payable from taxes on the portion of the County which is taxed for library service, rather than on all taxable property in the County.
2. Authorization of Bonds - The bonding and borrowing of money by the issuance of not to exceed \$15,950,000 Library general obligation bonds in 2009 (the "Bonds") is hereby authorized to finance (1) the costs of improvements set forth in the 2008 / 2009 capital improvement budget of the County, and (2) the costs of any other improvements set forth in the County's capital improvement budgets of any year, to the extent proceeds of the Bonds are not expended on improvements set forth in the 2008 / 2009 capital improvement budget due to changes occurring after the issuance of the Bonds.
3. Bonding Procedure and Terms - The Bonds shall be scheduled for sale and awarded for sale by resolutions. The specific amount, maturities, interest rates and other terms and conditions of the Bonds and covenants with respect to the Bonds shall be set or made by resolution.
4. Taxes - The Bonds shall be general obligations to which the full faith and credit and taxing powers of the County are pledged. The Bonds shall be paid from ad valorem taxes levied on all taxable property in the County outside the City of St. Paul and collected with other taxes, provided that the Bonds may also be paid from interest earnings on the debt service account, and from any other moneys appropriated by the County Board. The taxes levied for the payment of the Bonds shall not limit or reduce the ability of the County to levy taxes for the payment of the costs of other capital improvements or obligations issued to finance the payment of such costs. Taxes levied on property

(Continued)

outside the City of St. Paul shall be appropriated and credited to the debt service funds for the bonds, and shall reduce the taxes for the payment of the bonds otherwise required to be levied on property in the entire County. If ad valorem taxes levied upon all of the taxable property in the County which is outside the City of Saint Paul are not sufficient to pay the bonds, any deficiency shall be a general responsibility of the County and shall if necessary be paid from ad valorem taxes on all taxable property in the entire County.

5. Authorization of Refunding Bonds - The bonding or borrowing of money by the issuance of bonds or other obligations to refund the Bonds is hereby authorized on the same basis as set forth in paragraphs 4 and 5 of Ordinance No. 93-292, authorizing the refunding of bonds issued prior to November 6, 1992. Further proceedings to schedule such refunding bonds for sale, to set the terms and conditions thereof, to make covenants with respect thereto and to award the sale thereof may be, and are hereby authorized to be, done or taken by resolution.

(Chair Parker recessed the meeting at this point of the agenda; the meeting was reconvened in the afternoon)

BOARD OF RAMSEY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS – City of St. Paul Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District extension and pooling

Nancy Homans, City of St. Paul Mayor's Office, said she would address the Board in the absence of Todd Hurley, Budget Office, City of St. Paul. Answers not available today would be provided to the Commissioners prior to any action taken at the next County Board meeting.

Ms. Homans serves on the policy staff for Mayor Chris Coleman, and for the past three years has been working on the Central Corridor project. The vision for Central Corridor is more than tracks running down the middle of the street – a vision of an attractive destination surrounded by strong neighborhoods, successful small businesses for people who live and work there today to continue to enjoy the benefits of this major regional transit system.

This is an opportunity to leverage a \$1 billion dollar public investment to strengthen St. Paul and Ramsey County, and it is a balance between physical development and community development. A lot of planning work has been done over the last three years; they have talked to the community; understand what the communities' vision for the Central Corridor is in all its complexity; and determined that about \$150 million should be invested in streetscape improvements, parking mitigation, small business support, affordable housing, new parks, bike and pedestrian connections, and other amenities to make this the Corridor we all envision.

Determining the needs and uses was the easy part. Determining the sources for that \$150 M is more difficult. The City will be tapping into its own CIB budgets, applying for livable community funds, and looking to the traditional affordable housing sources, but those will not be enough. There are some critical short-term needs that are especially important for which new sources of funds are being sought. The most important of those relate to the streetscape in the Central Corridor, and the parking mitigation concerns for the small businesses in the Corridor. There is one opportunity to build University Avenue and rebuild it right so that it is a platform for economic development into the future. Part of the economic development for the future is supporting the small businesses that are there. There are about 12 blocks in the Corridor where with the loss of on-street parking represents a critical need, and we want to be about helping those blocks come up with alternative ways to support their businesses.

Ms. Homans said she could provide a map of that 12-block area. Most of the blocks are on the eastern end of the Corridor, although some are around Snelling Avenue where there are a number of small businesses which don't have their own parking lot. For other places, there is quite a bit of off-

(Continued)

street parking and opportunities for shared parking. There are about 12 places, where the City and the businesses have determined that their needs are critical.

One of the ideas for generating resources, quickly, is to ask the Legislature to allow the City to:

- 1) Pool four existing tax increment finance districts (TIFs) on University Avenue. Those include the Hubbard site, the Spruce Tree site, the Midway Shopping Center site, and a scattered-site district, which has a number of spots on University Avenue;
- 2) Extend the time period for those districts, the first slated to expire in 2014, but allow the shared district to expire in 2029; and
- 3) Allow to send those resources/proceeds on qualified improvements throughout the Central Corridor, defined as a quarter mile from the tracks from one end to the other. A new TIF district is not being created; no new real estate would be put into a TIF district, but would rather use the existing TIF districts. Today, we could have streetscape paved with gold in front of Hubbard Broadcast Center because that would be a qualified use of resources – the City is asking to use some of the proceeds from that district in other places on University Avenue for a strong Corridor from one end to the other.

Ms. Homans said the City is before the Board today because all of us have been working for a long time to build a regional transit system – the Commissioners have done some ‘heavy lifting’ over the last number of years to do the capital part of this project. The City is here because what is still missing is the community development part of this project, and because of the way transit is financed in this State at this time. We are constrained by federal funding formulas, by the resources we have available through the half-cent sales tax, by the state of our transit operating budget, which is having a hard time operating the bus system much less doing any of these extras that transit agencies in other metropolitan areas are able to do. The City is requesting permission to fill that other gap – the community development gap in the region’s transit corridor system. In the long term, we or the State are going to have to grapple with a sustainable way of doing this into the future, but for now, our time crunch is real. The City would like to make these improvements when the line is being constructed over the next five years, which means their resource needs, which approximate \$27.5 M for streetscape alone, and the parking, is several million dollars beyond that. Those funds have to be amassed early-on to be prepared to do it during construction.

Commissioner Rettman said three of the four TIFs were created when she was on the City Council and the criteria was to do it now, and eventually those properties would be returned so they would help out everyone. They would then be defeased and become part of the base. The map on pages 22 and 23 shows a half-mile Corridor going to Thomas. The map cited the “area within a quarter mile of the alignment”. Ms. Homans said it would be one quarter-mile each on the north and south side of the Corridor.

Commissioner Rettman said Ms. Homans had said none of the TIF areas would change; they would remain the same but the money could be used up and down, similar to what is already done in some of the TIFs right now if one is under-performing -- so why is the legislation needed.

Ms. Homans said to spend the money, they don’t need the legislation. The legislation is needed to pool and extend the district.

Commissioner Rettman asked how much the diagonal section in downtown St. Paul, referenced in the letter in the documentation, is a part of this. Ms. Homans said the estimated cost of that land is about \$5-6 M.

Commissioner Rettman asked if that is both acquisition and demolition. Ms. Homans said the demolition and asbestos abatement are covered in the project budget so the acquisition was a responsibility of someone other than the project.

Commissioner Rettman said the County taxpayers, both City and suburban, have already put in lots of money. Though the City of St. Paul has raised some money to do the study – what cash has it put in? The City wanted to buy the diagonal, which was the change in the Corridor allocation, why

*(Continued)*

doesn't the City fund that itself? Ms. Homans said they don't have information for exactly how they would pay for acquisition of it, but expect there are 10-12 resources they will be looking to, whether it is the City's own CIB, HRA, some possible federal dollars, TIF dollars. They are still working on assembling that process.

Commissioner Rettman cited the downtown TIF brought to the County Board last year for use as an ice rink. Why isn't some of that money being used for this? Why that same language isn't included to hold the County harmless as a quid pro quo, similar to what was done to the other TIF extensions, and, therefore, keep faith? The County Board took an aggressive stance on the CTIB, and yet there is nothing there. Why is the City of St. Paul letting the Met Council off the hook in providing the parking? They are the ones who took it out, and yet it should be part of this. They had abdicated that responsibility. Why rescue the Met Council from what they should be doing that all other projects have had to do?

Ms. Homans said the County has not done the normal construction on University Avenue for some years because of the pending light rail. The City has the sense that we are all sharing the improvement of an asset that belongs to all of us. She has her own thoughts about what the Met Council should or shouldn't be paying for, and the City is struggling with that as well. She said we are one team, and it is the days when we break off into opposing teams that are tough days, but we can spend as much time as possible bringing what we can to the table to do this right, acknowledging that we have different abilities to contribute, different resources to access, and different constituencies. There is no perfect solution. The Met Council has tough constraints, and she wished they would do more. At the end of the day, this is a benefit to all of us, and if we can all figure out a way to do what we can, we will get this done.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the City, County and Regional Railroad Authority have all had, and will continue to have, fights with the Met Council. She commended the City for fighting for things that are important. When there are things with definitive answers, decisions have to be made. The City has said this needs to be done on University Avenue. As much as we think Met Council, the federal government, or state government should be picking this up as was done on Hiawatha, they are not going to, so what can we do to come up with some innovative ways to deal with this? To do Central Corridor without these improvements on University Avenue makes no sense. This is all being paid for by the same taxpayers.

Commissioner Reinhardt referenced the newspaper article on the maintenance facility. If Central Corridor doesn't move forward, this won't make any difference. The year's delay would have a ripple effect on everybody. Hopefully, the City would have worked through its issue and have any concerns addressed by the time the County Board votes on this on March 17, and to her, that is critical.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the City is talking of an extension of 8-15 years on the TIF districts. She referenced the largest TIF district, #135 at Snelling and University, also for the largest amount of money, for 13 years. The extensions would all go out to 2029. Most important for her constituents in White Bear, Maplewood, North St. Paul, and one precinct in St. Paul, is that once these improvements are made, that the City retires the districts and that they don't just go to 2029. There is a detailed listing of what is to be done with the money, and the sooner those things are completed for Central Corridor, and have them paid for and retired, the sooner they will return to the tax rolls. That is critical for her when this comes back for support in going forward with the legislation; that it is for a specific purpose. Odds are that it will be done before 2029, and she doesn't want additional funds to be used anywhere else; rather to retire the districts and get them back on the tax rolls.

Ms. Homans responded absolutely. She also wanted to make sure the County Board understands that the City has not given up on trying to get the project to pay for streetscape; they are still working very hard on that. They also recognize that there may be some timing issues, and right

*(Continued)*

now, there is not money in the budget. It is not to say that contingency funds can't be used, but they are trying to give them maximum flexibility.

Commissioner Reinhardt said she meant to be clearer about that, and did not want to give the impression that the City had given up. But, the City is also looking at this from a realistic standpoint, and for this to go forward, plans need to be in place for how to recoup the funds. Again, if there is a way to recoup the funds, and it is a cash flow issue, it means the TIF district can be retired even earlier.

Commissioner Carter was glad to see the positioning of Plan B because of the timing and the need to assure that we are able to move forward with Central Corridor. The City is still attempting to get this paid for – we do have the same taxpayers – the City and the County, including suburbs, and will all benefit from Central Corridor. Betterments for the project have been discussed, which can be funded outside of the project budget and take advantage of the timing of the project happening while the street is open, with the opportunity to make some improvements that have been delayed and are needed. Also talked about have been items that could be considered betterments but would be better considered as part of the budget. To what extent is the City assessing that, and how is that conversation progressing because were we able to use any dollars in the future that might become available and how would those dollars be used and be returned to the taxpayers?

Ms. Homans said the permission to do this has not yet been given, and it is not going to be easy to get. The City is trying to stay true to the spirit of TIF and confine the uses to appropriate TIF-funded uses so public improvement is in the public realm and not to private benefit. But, they also recognize that parks, public art, and streetscape improvements, are all part of the character of the streets that support economic development, so it is not a cash payment to an individual of which TIF doesn't support. There are programs that support small businesses so they will be looking to CDBG (Community Development Block Grants) or some other sources to fill those buckets. They hope to have a comprehensive \$150 M budget and are being strategic about which sources fit which uses. With respect for how it will all happen, it may happen through all the normal processes so we get affordable housing proposals or redevelopment proposals, and this would be a source of funds to support that, assuming it is consistent with the Central Corridor strategy. The template is the development strategy, the policy is in the development strategy, and the sources would be matched to the most appropriate uses.

Commissioner Carter said that explanation answered her questions. She also heard that were we able to find other funds, they would not be attributed to this source, and we could retire early the TIF districts remaining open because we found other funding, which could also include the project budget where possible. Ms. Homans responded, absolutely.

Commissioner Bennett asked what is being done at Snelling and University to improve the traffic flow for constituents coming from the suburban areas. He hasn't heard anything about improving the traffic flow, which has been a problem for 30 years, and yet the County is being asked to pay for a lot of things in these neighborhoods. University Avenue is a County road and still a State highway. If that improvement is not made now, it will never be made.

Ms. Homans said she is not a traffic engineer, but could ask them for assistance. The City is doing an entire northwest area traffic analysis. Anything done on that intersection impacts that entire quadrant of the City so they are looking at how to reduce the pressure in that intersection. She does not have an impact study with her.

Commissioner Bennett said Maplewood and Rosedale Malls are in the suburbs. Downtown St. Paul has Macy's, and they have to come out Snelling Avenue to get to District 2. The County doesn't complain about City residents using County roads, but the City doesn't want improvements locally. It is time for people to understand that these arterial roads -- state and county roads -- are for everybody in the County, and that they are not neighborhood streets.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Rettman said she would like the County Manager to provide a detailed analysis on how this impacts the County budget to 2029; not just for the near budgets.

Commissioner Rettman said she has always appreciated the work by Ms. Homans back to the work done on Council 46, which created Energy Park and other projects. She brought people together. There have been numerous meetings in the neighborhood about land use. To her knowledge, there has not been a meeting on extending the district and pooling them. Some of the meetings have had vicious feelings of how the business mitigation might be for the future; that the mitigation for housing is not the current affordable housing and for the people there now, but for affordable housing for those yet to come, which is gentrification. How does this request for support address this? The City has not put in a dime on this. The City is hurting, but so is the County. We are not protected from the realities of what the economy is doing. How much of this is going to go for the Union Depot area? Is the City willing to carve that out because the County has another expenditure committed for the Union Depot? Is that a part of this plan?

Commissioner Rettman referenced page 6 of the documentation, and asked what are the improvements listed there if they do not include forking over this money in the TIF concept? If the County is held harmless in this TIF, she wants to make sure we have the dollars to deal with this. Absent that, what is this going to do? Is this going to cover the District Energy issues? Is this going to cover the utility issues? Is it going to cover the chocolate store in that district? The only parking they have is on-street; they were offered a loan. They will move their location elsewhere because they are being driven out because they have only two existing parking spaces. How is this going to affect Dale and Rice Streets? This is what people need to hear about. She asked if this concept would be discussed at the Conference to be held this weekend, and at another meeting to be held in a couple weeks. If we are going to do this, what is that vision? The people who have been there all along this Corridor have a right to stay. Where is that in this?

Commissioner Rettman is talking about people who have lifted these neighborhoods up for years. If they are gone, then the fabric of the community has been lost. What is this going to do about that? She wants more than just numbers from the City because the County may need that money to be held harmless. If the County says “yes”, it has to be held harmless; she would want that in writing.

Ms. Homans said she would have to follow-up on the answer for what it would take out of the budget if the County were to be held harmless; it would change the level of resources. The Union Depot would probably be an eligible expense. It is within a quarter of a mile of the Corridor, but she wasn't aware of a particular funding need. It had been expressed that there not be people such as herself talking at the Conference this weekend because there are other opportunities, but she would be attending, and would respond if any questions are asked. She would respect their agenda because this is them talking to one another.

On the questions of affordability and affordable housing, the Affordable Housing Partnership, the Community Stabilization Project and LISC (Local Initiative Support Corporation), have taken the lead in convening a group of folks around affordable housing strategies that relate to preservation and supporting existing households and the kind of households that are there today. The City is participating as a member, but they are helping the City shape that policy and keeping them honest about the commitment to maintain these neighborhoods for the people who live there now. When the Central Corridor Development Strategy was adopted in the area for the neighborhoods being discussed here, a very narrow area of change was created, recognizing the importance of the neighborhoods surrounding that Corridor. The City's policy is to protect those neighborhoods for the people who live there today.

The City's policy on small businesses is to use some of these resources to solve those parking problems. That may be doing landscaping and lighting in the alleys, creating a better parking lot or

***(Continued)***

shared parking opportunities. The small business folks and designers are working together to come up with a solution for each block that works for that block. She would not say today that this would work for the County or not, but the City's commitment is to come up with those plans and then find the resources, hopefully from the County, to help them do that. The City has applied to Livable Communities to help pay for that, but was turned down because it wasn't an eligible use so they are coming at it in a different way.

The City has asked the CDCs (Community Development Councils) in the neighborhood to work with the Neighborhood Development Center at Western Bank to come up with a game plan for supporting those small businesses because they have such good relationships with the small businesses today. They just received a grant from the Center's collaborative to do that work. They have done remarkable work, and the City expects to take a lead from them on the most critical needs of the existing small businesses. The City could then tailor its small business assistance program and align them with those goals.

One of the things about this project and the community development aspects of this project the City have committed to is that they are taking the lead from the people who live there. This is not a hierarchy; it is all the community groups who care about these issues; they are meeting, and doubling up these policies and priorities, and coming to the City to ask for help in how to implement it. This is an exciting but messy process, but it has integrity for this Corridor because of the unique nature of the Corridor. There are challenges every day, one of greatest being to find the resources to do what these folks are telling the City what needs to be done, and asking the County for support is one attempt to do that.

Commissioner Reinhardt recognized that University Avenue is a County, State and local road; not just a neighborhood street. Although she appreciates the fact that the City is taking its lead from the people that live in the area, when looking at the entire County to pay for it by extending the TIF district, it would seem the City would want some input from the other communities in Ramsey County. She uses University Avenue often, and lives in White Bear Lake; suburban residents use these streets, and they will use Central Corridor. This should be opened up to allow the suburbanites some input because they are also being asked to pay for it. It is a community asset, not just a neighborhood asset and that is where we have run into some problems in the past.

Ms. Homans responded that the point is well taken.

Commissioner Carter said the conference this weekend is a coalition of folks from all over, who have concerns, who will present those concerns and solutions to the City for systems and meeting needs. She asked for clarification that the solutions for University Avenue that would be designed and funded through this TIF would only be heard from those in the immediate neighborhood a quarter mile away from University Avenue. We are all in this world together. The partners on the County Board tend to make decisions not parochially based on any particular neighborhood concern but based on the fact that we have places throughout the districts that all interact with each other, that all respect each other, interested in seeing whether it is from a human services perspective or from a capital outlay perspective, places within which all of us can live, work and interact that are good healthy spaces. That would include freeways that run through inter-city neighborhoods, University Avenue, the Central Corridor. We need to recognize that we have neighborhood streets and freeways that benefit all of us; we can utilize developments in the suburban areas, which benefit City residents. We are in a global and regional community. Her neighborhood street is open and welcoming to everyone within the County. This is not about competition, but about space-making for all of us.

Commissioner Carter said she appreciates all the work that has been done. She asked Ms. Homans if her response about responding to neighborhood concerns was about everything within the context of this budget.

*(Continued)*

Ms. Homans responded negatively. The City has lots of neighborhood folks, advocacy groups, and people with broad constituencies that are part of the process. For the streetscape and the design of the street, that is happening in large measure at the Central Corridor project office, which is a team of regional, County and City engineers, landscape architects, architects, designers, working at the project office with the consultant to do the streetscape design. They took a lot of input from neighborhood folks, but the plan that has been developed to try to figure out how to pay for this was developed with the full participation of County staff.

Commissioner Carter said Snelling Avenue is a congested area within the County. She asked for an update on the specifics of the process moving forward in the large study. She hoped that would not hold up the movement on this particular request, but wanted to make sure that is a place that is made best for all of us.

Commissioner Bennett said Ms. Homans does a good job in responding to questions. The County Board works together very well. The Board understands that the entire County is important, and works well with other counties in joint powers boards. He could not say that is always true in working with the City. Ms. Homans' comment about a meeting with local people invited may have raised the concern of the Commissioners. County people are concerned. Snelling-University is important to us. The Mayor just announced a new skating rink near Xcel, which will bring more people into this area, and the City hasn't gotten light rail into that area yet. That is the busiest area in downtown St. Paul. Several mayors have said more retail would be brought into downtown, and that hasn't happened. We need to show off what we've got in our County.

Commissioner Reinhardt clarified her earlier reaction to Ms. Homan's comment about taking direction and leadership from the neighborhoods; that is fine, they need to have input. That is what she was reacting to, not that the City wouldn't listen to anyone else. It is important that it is open. The Central Corridor Committee is looking at that as a whole. What might be helpful to understand is that when it came to the discussion about the alternatives in that particular neighborhood, many of the Commissioners were inundated with emails that basically said "this is my neighborhood, how dare you even discuss it". Now, we are discussing that neighborhood, and the City wants tax money to come from the TIF. There is some sensitivity there. It is not insurmountable, but it goes both ways. She is looking at this as a whole, and believes there is benefit for her constituents, not just in Central Corridor and the economic development as far as the tax base that would ultimately be there, which would help her residents as well. She will continue coming back to this, that if the City were to get this support, to retire the debt and make sure it does what it says it will do. There should be some way of guaranteeing that once this is done, which might be well before 2029, that the districts be retired, because that would be the biggest benefit to accomplishing this, and for her constituents.

Commissioner Rettman said that when sitting on the City Council, these same things were said about these districts. That is exactly what would happen – they would be defeased. She had brought in one of the TIFs that was defeased early because it had completed its task. Today, we are looking at breaking that codicil that the neighborhoods were promised when it was voted on in 1987, 1990, and on. The City is asking the County to rescind that wisdom of the folks who created it. There has to be a threshold for doing that; has that been met?

Commissioner Rettman had questions about the Cost-Effectiveness Index (CEI). Several of the issues identified here or in other documents in terms of parking, bicycle/pedestrian connections, and open space were all identified in the draft EIS, the supplemental EIS, and the final EIS, and part of the CEI. How is that being interrelated? That is a financial issue. If the CEI doesn't have to be a factor in this, then why aren't the station locations included, which is one of the concerns for the neighborhoods, as well as the suburban areas in making sure there are adequate stations with feeders. Feeder bus routes to the Corridor are huge, and this has been a big issue with the County. She has not seen any

*(Continued)*

park and ride areas in the suburban area to address that issue. Reading this TIF documentation, all the properties that are going to be the recipients of this, 80% have to be within the half-mile area – how does the City relate to that? Representative Hausman has had concerns about the Capitol approach – does this address any of those concerns? Does it address any of the concerns of mitigation that have been raised for the maintenance facility? Does it address any of the mitigations down Cedar Street? Those are critical. She is not there yet – half of this money could go to the County and half designated for the project to deal with some of those issues of great importance to Ramsey County – this has the City making all the decisions, not the County. There are many issues to address the livability of the neighborhood, the viability that exists there. Ramsey County is the leader on CTIB (Counties Transit Improvement Board), with the City seated at that table; does the County have an equal seating at this table?

Ms. Homans said there have been many good questions about the stations. The City has tried to make sure Met Council pays for what is Met Council's. They have tried to stay away from the transit line itself. There is a good understanding that there is the line then there is everything outside the line. The City has been a part of everything outside the line. That has been their hesitance about getting involved in bus service or stations and those types of things and that they continue to believe the Met Council should address.

With respect to parks, parking mitigation, and bicycle connections, those have all been understood as important. It can't be afforded under the CEI as part of the project, and therefore, that is another one of those situations like streetscape where the City is saying these are critical but we need to figure out a different way to pay for them. In other places where we don't depend on federal money, all those are in the project budget, but because we are depending on federal money, we have to deal with CEI formula that restricts our ability to do some of these outside of the line improvements.

As to the decision-making, those are things she had not thought of, but that is perfectly reasonable. She had not thought of the governance of this, but if we want to divide up issue areas, whatever they might be, we could talk about those.

Chair Parker introduced Chris Samuel, Property Records and Revenue, Ramsey County's TIF specialist in the taxation area. She asked Mr. Samuel to explain the incremental cost to the County for this. It is already assumed that these four TIF districts would be paid off. Now with the extension, what is the difference in increments from the current expectations versus if this goes through exactly as proposed?

Mr. Samuel said the difference is \$4.5 M annually. It is that piece above and beyond for the additional years that would be in place. The increment would be for all governmental units, a total tax dollar of which a piece of that would be the County's.

Chair Parker asked what that would mean for the County in terms of revenue. Mr. Samuel said roughly 40% of the total \$4.5 M a year, or about \$1.8 M, would be the County's share.

Chair Parker said that explanation provides a better picture for this discussion.

Commissioner Rettman asked how much the County got for downtown annually. Mr. Samuel said he would have to look at those numbers.

Commissioner Rettman said she thought it was around \$3-4 M. The County Manager has been asked to provide some numbers. Looking at all four of the TIFs aggregately it would be \$1.8 M as the County's share. She asked that Mr. Samuel review page 28, which references the figures for pooling from Spruce Tree, the scattered sites, Snelling-University, and Hubbard, because she understands this differently from the response that has been given.

Mr. Samuel said he would review the entire document. Ms. Homans had made a good point, when talking about the dollars here. Those are not additional dollars available to the County; that is the benefit to the taxpayers. The tax base is going back to the taxpayers so it reduces taxes for everyone

*(Continued)*

by that amount as opposed to necessarily being an additional benefit to the County in additional dollars that are available.

Commissioner McDonough said the other part of Commissioner Rettman's question is that if the district was defeased, but if made whole, then those dollars would come to the County.

Mr. Samuel said staff could build what those numbers would be, equivalent to what was worked out last year with the downtown district as to what the County's share would be.

Commissioner Rettman said for the County's share coming annually -- that is not the way this is currently written. She reads that as one number and the other is if it goes to the City or to this, it is only spent in that half-mile Corridor.

Mr. Samuel said they could come up with what that hold harmless number would be equivalent to what was done for the downtown district last year.

Chair Parker said usually when the County Board is presented with TIF proposals, they are based on the assumption that "but-for" the public infrastructure improvements, a certain development would not take place. What are the plans for the development piece of this? She understands the need for all the infrastructure improvements, but what has changed in these four TIF districts that will be generating more value to the property other than just stretching it out for a longer term?

Ms. Homans said that she doesn't know that in each of the areas the City is expecting development to happen. For instance, she doesn't know that we are expecting a more intense development at Spruce Tree Center. However, at the Midway Shopping Center, there has been quite a lot of discussion that over time, creating a street grid in that parking lot and creating development opportunities to intensify the development of that. That is all included in the Central Corridor Development Strategy. Where there are redevelopment opportunities, significant land, there is a template development plan of zoning codes, etc., related to that. She did not know that that intensification is possible in each of the TIF districts that are proposed to being pooled. She would have to look at the scattered site to provide a more exact answer.

Commissioner McDonough asked for the example given for Midway Shopping Center, if that is in the TIF. Ms. Homans said there are two TIF districts there, one is Spruce Tree and one is Snelling-University.

Commissioner McDonough said there are probably going to be uses for the TIF dollars that would stimulate economic development and stimulate increased tax capacity that won't be in the TIF district that would actually benefit taxpayers of this community by the use of these dollars.

Ms. Homans said that is absolutely the point. They believe the streetscape improvements, the affordable housing, the small business support, will strengthen the Central Corridor on University Avenue, up and down, and there will be development that is not captured in this TIF. Most of it will not be captured in the TIF, and will be a benefit to the citizens of Ramsey County.

Chair Parker asked if as those future developments take place, is the plan that additional TIF districts would be created to capture that revenue.

Ms. Homans said it is unlikely that they would use TIF as a primary source for that development. The City believes the Central Corridor is creating an opportunity where public financing will not be as critical. The public financing is this billion dollar infrastructure, and it will spur private development and private investment. They already see it at one end throughout the Corridor.

Commissioner Ortega thanked Ms. Homans for presenting this proposal.

Chair Parker said this will come back to the County Board with answers to the questions raised and with the additional information on March 17, 2009.

*(Continued)*

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Nick Riley, Intergovernmental Relations, reported that the Governor's forecast came out this morning. When using the budget reserve and the unallotment from the Governor, it more than offsets the additional projected decline in revenue and increase in spending. Inflation is still not included in the number.

Commissioner McDonough said that is for 2008 where there is a surplus.

Mr. Riley said there is a surplus in 2009. The State's fiscal year ends July 1. They unallotted even though it was in the County's 2008.

Commissioner Bennett asked if we had asked for a partial refund.

Mr. Riley responded negatively. The City had mentioned that. They anticipate that the stimulus package will help that between \$1.2-1.4 B. The number in the out-year 2012-2013 is projected at about \$5.5 B. A lot done in the Governor's budget were one-time fixes. Unless they deal with that structural deficit, it is going to continue. They are projecting the current recession to be deeper and longer than anticipated. Currently Minnesota has lost 55,000 jobs as part of this recession. By the end of the year, it is anticipated to be 120,000 jobs.

Terry Speiker, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, distributed summary copies of the forecast to the Commissioners. There is also a good assessment on the Minnesota Council on Non Profits website. The Commissioners have been interested in trying to figure out what this means for the human services side of the spending, and there is good information at that site. Because of the federal stimulus and the increase in reductions, it ends up like a wash. There is still about a \$4.6 B deficit that has to be made up in 2010-2011, which does not include much for inflation. The Governor will have to come back with a new budget. He has told some of the committees to expect a budget within about two weeks.

Commissioner Bennett said the Governor has to give them a new budget. They are figuring on about \$1.6 B coming in from the stimulus package, some of which is earmarked.

Mr. Riley said about \$1.4 B is for MA reimbursements.

Commissioner Bennett said that will take precedence. The Governor's budget had been about \$4.3 B, but the changes will be based on the stimulus money.

Ms. Speiker said there are two big areas where the Governor will have to make major changes in his budget; one is in education and the other is in health care.

Mr. Riley said in the stimulus bill, it is \$1.2 B for a federal medical assistance percentage, which reduces the State's spending because they are reimbursing the State this money. It is a budget matter that reduces the State's spending to look better as well.

Commissioner Bennett said the Governor could take the \$1.6 B and move it someplace else.

Mr. Riley said one of the problems the Governor had in his budget was cutting spending in that area, and he can't accept the federal money if cutting any of the programs.

Commissioner Bennett said in some areas, the Governor will have to go with the spending which could be higher than what his budget was.

Mr. Riley concurred and said it is very complicated. The Governor held a press conference this morning, where he said he still will have no new taxes; he would do this all through cuts.

Commissioner McDonough agreed that this is really complicated; there are parts of the Governor's original budget he will have to increase to get the federal stimulus. On the education piece, he had originally budgeted to use the shift, which was \$1.3 B. To accept the federal stimulus dollars it is \$800 M, but he can't do the shift so it causes another \$.5 B negative by accepting the stimulus dollars. There are a lot of those pieces to be sorted out to get to the end.

Mr. Riley said that is hard for people to get their arms around because the Governor has to do a whole new budget and his assumptions are much different than the first budget. This information was

*(Continued)*

not put out by the Governor, rather from economists, with just the facts on what the budget projects are and the fact that he unallotted. For the Governor's new budget, he has to readjust all his numbers because of some of the things Commissioner McDonough alluded to and some of the things that are in this forecast. His budget will be much different because he has to find new areas he can cut so it will cut in a lot of areas he might have held sacrosanct before.

Commissioner Ortega felt the Commissioners all understood from a couple weeks back that because of the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) from the federal government that the Governor's budget would have to go up in certain areas. If the Governor is not going to have any revenues, and the County is going to face cuts in certain areas that have to double from his original budget, the Commissioners should know what those areas are. The stimulus package is old news, we know what is coming down, we know how it places the budget, but where are the areas. If you're not going to raise the revenues and this is a swing of roughly 30%, there have to be cuts deeper into those other areas – that is where the County will be impacted in the budget.

Ms. Speiker said that is right. The Governor will give a picture of his plans sometime in the next two weeks. The committees in the House and Senate will be giving their budget committees their targets sometime in the next 20-25 days. We will see what number they think they ought to have and we will see what his proposals look like. She had asked Representative Alice Hausman how she saw this coming together. The response was that hearings would begin and people would be able to tell sometime toward the end of March what it might really mean, at which time staff should be able to provide a better picture to the County Board about that question.

Commissioner Ortega said last week the County Board spent a half-day on the County's budget. The Governor's targets might be the best ones to take for certain departments. In order for the Governor to balance his budget without raising revenue, that would be the worst case scenario to use. From a budgeting perspective, the County could look at where we are going to potentially hurt the most in terms of delivering the service to our communities. Ms. Speiker agreed.

Commissioner Bennett said we already know where the stimulus money is going. The Governor has mandates from the federal government regarding that money.

Commissioner Ortega said the Governor has to set new targets, and act right away. The County would know definitively where the battleground is by the Governor's targets. There is no sense in doing work that might lead nowhere. We will know more in two weeks.

Commissioner Rettman said Senator Anderson, Representatives Hausman and Lesch, held a town meeting on Saturday, where they did a nice job explaining the cuts. They also believe that May 18 is the date. She agreed with Commissioner Ortega in looking at the worst case scenario.

Mr. Riley cautioned that the Governor held some areas like corrections where he would not cut. He may have to revisit that, but if he doesn't, it doesn't mean that the Legislature would not revisit it. If they know he doesn't want to cut somewhere, they will put that up so that he levels out somewhere else. It will be tough and almost to the end before we have our arms around this. He is certain that the Democrats will propose some type of revenue – possibly half cuts; half revenue. The Governor won't go along with that right now. There aren't three votes in the House to count on to override the Governor on anything. In the end, it will likely be closer to the Governor's number but spread in a different area. Higher education will take a bigger hit than they have in the past. Student loans are helped out in the stimulus package, but they will be asked to pay a larger share of higher ed costs.

Commissioner McDonough said in the Governor's original budget, he protected higher ed, veteran's services, public safety -- \$16 B out of the \$37 B budget. If his new budget continues to protect that piece, and the stimulus has created some of these shifts, it will just be larger cuts coming out of an even smaller piece of the pie. The big policy fight is going to be about where the cuts come

*(Continued)*

from on the size of this pie. The stimulus dollars in some sense have helped in some areas, but if the Governor holds true to protecting \$16 B of the \$37 B budget, it means larger cuts coming out of a smaller piece of the pie, which for the most part for Ramsey County means human services and public health.

Commissioner Reinhardt said she and other Commissioners have attended some of the listening sessions across Ramsey County and the State. The listening sessions for legislators were talking about the Governor's proposed budget and what people think about it. She attended the session held in White Bear Lake. What hopefully will come out is that it is not just a spending problem, not just a revenue problem, it is a combination. We need to stick together; the business climate needs to be good because that has an impact on what happens with jobs; and prevent people from leaving the State because of taxes. The message she heard is that it is about balance. The Courts were there in full force to talk about what this means to them. They are not a department, rather, a separate branch of government. When it comes to services provided by County government, a majority testifying talked about different services and why they are important, with two-thirds to three-fourths explaining why the cuts should not be made. She is hopeful that the Governor and Legislators will look at this for what it is. The problem has taken many years to get here, and there is not one easy answer to correct it.

Ms. Speiker said the summary document, press release, PowerPoint and other materials are available on the State's Office of Management and Budget website. When thinking about the reductions in funding, even with the stimulus package factored in, the Governor's proposal in his current budget still has 60% of his budget proposals that are one-time solutions. That still leaves the structural budget deficit, the structural imbalance, making it more challenging for the Commissioners to try to figure out how to plan.

Commissioner Ortega said it is not just the one-time fixes, and we know the dangers of that. By accepting the stimulus money and coming up to that level, what are the tails on that for the County? When the County does budgeting, it will not be just for the next two years. Do you go back to where we were on medical assistance and everything else? We need an analysis for this. Ramsey County may be in better shape than some others, but if this goes long, we need to have a better sense long-term, beside the one-time money.

Ms. Speiker said there is new money in the stimulus bill for child care, which is great. That would be absorbed into the County's budget, but is in fact, one-time money. That creates people who need assistance with child care, who now have access to sliding-fee or additional child care. The red flag for the County is in trying to figure out what that means internally in this community when that money may go away at the end of two years, and there isn't something perhaps in the President's bill that would follow.

Commissioner Ortega concurred.

Commissioner McDonough said the premise is that this stimulates the economy enough and there won't be the need for child care in two to three years because people will be working, but that is the roll of the dice.

Mr. Riley said our County Program Aid could disappear. Half of it was already taken. It is a big pot of money – LGA is a big pot of money and they'll look at that. They might take away levy limits, but the discretionary will likely be gone. Another area the Governor proposes to use is the tobacco fund and to bond for that money so he is doing a one-time fix, so at the end of his term it would be somebody else's problem – basically our problem. The Legislature may not let the Governor go there, but he is taking long-term money out of the picture by doing that because it is a ten-year bonding cycle that he would be taking the tobacco money from. These are the kinds of things we need to be careful of and analyze what happens.

Ms. Speiker said the Board had passed a support item for the high speed rail initiative. She distributed copies of the letter State Legislators have been circulating, which would be sent to the

*(Continued)*

Minnesota Federal Congressional Delegation, to look at a request for a \$0.5 B for the high speed rail line described in the Midwest High Speed Rail Initiative. Tim Mayasich, Director, Regional Railroad Authority, had asked that this be provided to the Board today as an information item, to be brought back to the Board on March 17 for formal support of the larger request.

Commissioner McDonough agreed that that be brought back on March 17. There is a lot of effort being put into work with Wisconsin for a potential joint request between Minnesota and Wisconsin to make the full request for the build-up from St. Paul to Chicago. Madison to Milwaukee has been built-out and Wisconsin is working on the Milwaukee to Madison piece. There have been conversations with MN/Dot about how they would position our rail projects as they are formulating their State rail plan. The high speed rail bill specifically says states don't have to have a rail plan in place to access these dollars, which is helpful. A resolution of support could come back on March 17 in support of the \$500 M for the Minnesota portion plus possible support for a Wisconsin-Minnesota request for the whole build-out. That would be the request to MN/Dot to be the lead on pushing that forward with the Governor's support.

Mr. Riley noted that this is a legislative request. Ramsey County had supported it in its package for \$5 M for the Union Depot – we don't know how much Ramsey County's portion would be of that \$500 M. This is for the entire length of the line in Minnesota, which would benefit the entire line, plus benefit the Red Rock Line if this happens making that line very viable and cost-effective. There are a lot of implications if it does happen.

Mr. Riley said the House and Senate are looking at their own economic stimulus proposals through bonding. Senator Mee Moua's office requested him to provide anything the County departments may have available. Parks and Recreation is the only department with those types of projects ready to go. The three projects that would be ready to go by summer 2009 were listed on a hand-out. These items had previously come before the Board in different ways and the information could be provided to Legislators if that is the desire of the Board, with the idea that this would be in addition to what the County's bonding requests are. There have already been hearings on all the bonding requests to this point.

Commissioner Ortega said all this came to the Board very recently. There should be consensus among the Commissioners to ask Mr. Riley and Ms. Speiker to move on these for the State stimulus.

Commissioner Bennett said he would make a motion after asking a question. Was the first sheet handed out to request money from the ISTE A bill?

Mr. Riley responded negatively; that is not the County's request. That is the signed letter from the Legislators.

Commissioner McDonough said a resolution would be brought forward on March 17.

Commissioner Bennett said ISTE A hopes to be on the floor by June 1<sup>st</sup>. He asked if the March 17 date isn't pushing it for the \$450-500 B?

Commissioner McDonough said the high speed rail dollars is out of the \$8 billion available for competitive grants. The Secretary of Transportation has 60 days to come up with guidelines and another 120 days to come up with the process to do the competitive bidding so March 17 is not too late.

Commissioner Bennett asked if Commissioner McDonough is looking at the \$9.2 B out of the stimulus package.

Commissioner McDonough said it is actually \$8 B because Amtrak gets \$1.2 B; that is the dedicated high speed rail piece of the stimulus package.

Commissioner Bennett said according to his information, Congressman Oberstar plans to have the new bill.

Commissioner McDonough said that is the reauthorization bill.

Mr. Riley said the County has requests in for that as well.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Bennett moved for support the of high speed rail dollars.

Commissioner Ortega said the other bill is the reauthorization; it doesn't stop the County from applying for money there either.

Commissioner McDonough said if it is not out of order to pass the resolution in support today, he would be fine with doing that. On high speed rail, the intent was to come on March 17 with the resolution to be broad enough to include support of and work on the \$500 M for the Minnesota portion, and to include in that resolution to support the work with the State of Wisconsin for a potential joint request to do the complete build-out together from St. Paul to Chicago. He would want that as a part of the whole motion.

Commissioner Bennett asked if that would come out of the next one.

Commissioner McDonough said it is hoped to get the support to do that out of the \$8 B.

Gary Davis, Assistant County Attorney, said with regard to that motion on the Minnesota Economic Stimulus projects, given the fact that they were not specified in the agenda, they would have to wait until March 17.

Commissioner McDonough said he is fine with that for March 17. There is time on Congressman Oberstar's piece for the reauthorization.

Commissioner Reinhardt said in previous years the Board has listed on the Agenda: Legislative Update - Action May Be Taken. She had specifically asked that that be added to this Agenda to address some of these issues. In this case, these items can wait until March 17, but as things heat up, from this point forward, she wants that on the Agenda. A motion could be made today to direct staff to bring back a resolution on March 17 that would be for final action that day.

Commissioner Bennett moved to direct staff to bring back a resolution on March 17 for final action for support on the request for \$500 M, including outreach to the State of Wisconsin to support the joint application for funds, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Roll Call: Ayes – McDonough, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Parker – 6. Nays – 0.  
[Final action will be taken on this motion on March 17, 2009.]

Commissioner Ortega said no motion is needed to move on the three Parks and Recreation Department projects. It has been discussed recently, and these are things the County wants to do; it is just a matter of where they go in the pipeline in terms of paying for them. How to get the resources is what this is about.

Commissioner Rettman, for clarification on the Keller Regional Park Redevelopment project, said this is just for the picnic shelters and not for the golf course. The Board has been supportive of the Trillium site, Cayuga, and Rice Streets. She asked that Mr. Riley contact Greg Mack, Director, Parks and Recreation Department. If the County is going to support Wisconsin, we should also support the City of St. Paul going forth on the State trail to see if that could be added.

Chair Parker noted the tracking sheet distributed to the Commissioners. Ms. Speiker said this is the second tracking sheet put together by staff.

Chair Parker asked if there would be an opportunity to contact any of the Wisconsin Congressional representatives or county commissioners.

Commissioner McDonough said it has been discussed to connect with some Congressional people on the Wisconsin item during the NACo Conference, but the timing may need to be later when it is more definitive with more answers to the questions.

Ms. Speiker said staff will arrange a meeting for any Commissioner able to attend a meeting with Jason Rohloff, the Governor's lobbyist who is in Washington DC. The Governor would be asked to connect with Governor Doyle.

Commissioner Bennett asked if it would be possible to connect with Wisconsin's Governor's lobbyist. Ms. Speiker responded that they could try.

*(Continued)*

Mr. Riley said he had asked Emily Gehrman from Lockridge to set up the meeting with Mr. Rohloff and would ask her to connect with the Wisconsin Governor's lobbyist; it would be good to get the two together.

#### BOARD CHAIR UPDATE

Chair Parker reported:

- That the Fridley groundbreaking for the station site for the Northstar Commuter Rail would take place this afternoon at 4:00 p.m.

#### OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Reinhardt:

- Reported that the Maplewood Library won another award, the 2009 Upper Midwest Design/Build Award for Best Project in Public Sector Building. The County should be proud of taking the time to make sure the building was built environmentally, efficiently, and cost-effectively.

Commissioner Rettman:

- Reported that the Ramsey County League of Local Governments meeting on the Ramsey County Groundwater Protection Plan postponed on February 26 due to weather has been rescheduled for 7:00 p.m., Thursday, March 12, 2009, at Shoreview City Hall, 4600 Victoria Street. All municipalities and the County will be called upon to act on that plan.

Commissioner Bennett:

- Reported on a meeting of the TAB (Transportation Advisory Board), a committee for Met Council, about where the stimulus money would go. For the 494/169 interchange project, it would be the third time changes would have been made in the last 10-12 years. The Governor may not put any money into transportation, but just use stimulus money, leaving no money for any other projects. He and Tim Mayasich, Regional Railroad Authority, are watching this and will fight it. Even Washington County may not fight this. They do not want an east/west war.

Chair Parker said that was discussed at the Eastern Transportation Alliance meeting on Friday. Commissioner Myra Peterson felt that there are already votes, and it may not be worth fighting because we may be able to get something later.

Commissioner McDonough said Commissioner Peterson has bought into it and believes those two projects will be a crosstown-tech project that takes up tons of dollars. Her thought is that as long as we have the federal dollars now, to get them done and out of the way.

Commissioner Bennett said the I694 Bridge and the Highway 36 Bridge are being held up; we are ready to do Highway 49 with the turnback money. We can't seem to get anything on the list and haven't for 12-15 years.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that point was made at the Eastern Transportation Alliance.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Parker declared the meeting adjourned.