

The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners met in regular session with the following members present: Bennett, Haigh, Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner and McDonough – 7. Also present were Paul Kirkwold, County Manager; Susan Gaertner, County Attorney; and Gary Davis, Assistant County Attorney, County Attorney's Office.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

Commissioner Haigh moved, seconded by Commissioner Ortega, to approve the Agenda of the January 22, 2002 Board Meeting as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0.

MINUTES

Commissioner Ortega moved, seconded by Commissioner Haigh, to approve the Minutes of the January 15, 2002 Board Meeting as presented. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0.

PUBLIC WORKS – Discussion and Request for Direction – Reconstruction of CSAH 49 from Bridge Street to Birch Lane South

Ken Haider, Director, Public Works, said in 1972, the County Board adopted a cost participation policy. The agreement for the Highway 49 project was presented to the North Oaks City Council patterned after that participation policy. The North Oaks City Council has taken no action, so Ramsey County Public Works cannot go ahead with this project at this point. The Department requested County Board discussion and asked the Board if they would allow representatives from the City of North Oaks to state their case. Tom Watson, Mayor, City of North Oaks, and Jim March, Administrator for the City of North Oaks, were present.

Commissioner Rettman asked for an explanation on the policy, how it has been implemented, and whether there have been any deviations from the policy. She asked what is different on this from other cost issues.

Mr. Haider explained that the policy was established in 1972 to identify how costs on construction and maintenance projects would be split between the County and local agencies, in this case, cities and townships. The policy has changed over the 30 years because of changes in state aid rules or engineering standards, etc. Typically when a change was proposed, there was an opportunity for all the affected local agencies, cities and townships, to attend meetings to discuss those changes. This has been a widely discussed policy with general exceptions, and to his knowledge, there has never been any deviation from the policy on the part of the County Board. The method in which the policy was created was very participatory with the partners.

Commissioner Rettman asked if there are other ways the municipalities can pass on that cost to either the property tax owners by assessments or other ways? She asked if the cost sharing formulas have not deviated, is it up to the municipalities to determine how the cost sharing will occur.

Mr. Haider said that is correct. It has always been part of the policy that the County pays for everything it can pay for through federal or county state aid or other funding sources. What is left becomes the local responsibility. The County never wanted to proscribe how those local agencies

(Continued)

would finance that portion of the project. There are a number of funding mechanisms available in the statutes to cities making it possible to come up with funds.

Tom Watson, Mayor, City of North Oaks, said he received a copy of the 1972 cooperative agreement through the Public Works Department. He does not have a disagreement with the policy, but suggested on another day he would like to come back to discuss updating the policy. A prepared handout was distributed to the Board.

Commissioner Wiessner requested Mr. Watson explain what it is he wants.

Mr. Watson said the County approached the City of North Oaks about five years ago at the time of the State turnback legislation. Different forms of participation have been discussed and the City provided a conditional approval on this project as a part of the July 2000 concept report. They set a final meeting in October 2001 inviting the County to attend.

There are eight property owners who would be impacted by whatever decisions are made. There are three religious organizations that have the vast majority of that land. The ninth property owner is the Chippewa Middle School. The City does not dispute the questions about some of the traffic signal costs, the emergency vehicle preemption devices and others. They are a small community, governed by State law as are other communities. Their levy limit this year is \$902,000. The portion allocated to them of \$242,000 for this project, represents about 27% of their budget. That is a huge bite of their budget.

Commissioner Reinhardt said construction projects as this are done by assessment versus part of the levy for the cities.

Mr. Watson said that is correct, and state law has to be followed, which is Chapter 429, and has to do with assessing to the extent of value to be realized by the property owner.

Commissioner Reinhardt said in #11 he is referring to that as being part of their levy, when in fact it would be an assessment.

Mr. Watson said cities take responsibilities for the budget in the cooperative agreement with the County. As a City, they can chose to assess under Chapter 429 but the value of exchange has to be satisfied. City councils could spend the money out of the general fund and not assess anything; it is a discretionary decision of the local unit of government.

Commissioner Bennett asked if the City's levy limit is \$902,000, are the streets repaired and plowed out of that budget.

Mr. Watson said they are not. That is a separate homeowners assessment dues fee assessed to every property owner based on a developed lot, which for this year is about \$625.

Commissioner Rettman said this project is for a major road.

Commissioner Bennett said that is correct and explained that North Oaks is surrounded by four county roads: County Road J on the north, Centerville Road on the east, Highway 96 on the south, and Hodgson Road/Highway 49 on the west.

Commissioner Rettman said a percentage could be assessed. She asked if the \$242,000 could be spread over two years.

Mr. Haider said the cities have latitude in doing any number of things.

Commissioner Rettman asked when the County's bill would be presented to the cities.

Mr. Haider responded in 2003.

Commissioner Rettman said there is time to set aside that money.

Mr. Watson said there is a margin in there of \$53,000. He indicated #13 and 14 in his handout and said this is an opportunity to upgrade a road, but it is not done because of any eminent safety concerns there. Citing page 3, where issues are presented, the following were discussed: A) Remediation for drainage on this property near Incarnation Church is very vast and far too

extensive, which has been verified by other independent civil engineers. B) The estimated correction in terms of unit costs are 50% higher for the work done or estimated by other engineers that might be advising the County other than Short Elliott Hendrickson. C) Talks about the City ownership of the storm sewer main drain located under the road surface on County right of way -- the City does not have a public works department and they have no means of taking care of that. There is an indemnification clause that says the city is to indemnify the County; for the City, that is a dead issue. All of the issues were presented to the property owners by the City.

With the issue on the traffic signal, the County wants to install a new signal with new technologies, which functionally may work better. There is no residual value placed in the budget for the fact that there will be multiple years of life remaining on the signal that is there, and yet the budget shows the full cost for a new signal. The assessments for the full cost of about \$50,000 will be challenged by the property owners.

As to the provision in the agreement that the City will provide a blank check to the County and the contractor for any supplemental agreements the County may enter into for utilities and facilities – the City will be responsible for some of those costs, the amounts are for material, but if it is a material amount, the City wants to know about it.

The City won't sign indemnification to provide blank indemnification to the County, the contractor, or anyone else, for that whole hold harmless provision. He cited the 1996 situation when their city attorney provided some language that was then acceptable.

The City of North Oaks is not challenging policies. It is challenging excessive construction and excessive construction costs related to drainage.

Commissioner Reinhardt asked who are the individuals referred to as other qualified engineers, and why is it thought they are better than County staff, and were they paid for this information?

Mr. Watson said he looked at whether there is true value at a cost of \$500,000 for a one-third mile road. Mr. Roos, a civil engineer as a paid consultant engineer to the City receiving about \$300,000 in services and fees over the year, was asked for an opinion on this budget. They discussed only the drainage portion, which is the only thing being disputed on this project.

Commissioner Reinhardt asked what the cost is on the drainage.

Mr. Watson answered that for the City of North Oaks it is about \$180,000.

Commissioner Reinhardt asked if Mr. Roos put this in writing, was an in-depth study done?

Mr. Watson said he is not suggesting that a report was written on this project. Mr. Roos has been involved in all the discussion on this project since it began. More time has been spent on this project in the last 18 months than anything else in this community.

Commissioner Reinhardt said if Mr. Roos has anything, clearly that would be necessary for her to state that the cost should be different than what Public Works staff has put together, something based on more than just a cursory review.

Mr. Watson said to be clear, in looking at drainage, to differentiate two ingredients: the unit cost that has been projected has been too high and the quality involvement to the area to be served. Parcel by parcel, the properties are incorrectly delineated. These are non-impervious surface properties.

Commissioner Reinhardt asked if they have something to back that up.

Mr. Watson said if that is needed, they would get Mr. Roos involved. They can apportion costs to the individual parcels through the assessment proceeding if they can establish that benefits are received. They are trying to establish what that benefit is. The City Council has taken the

(Continued)

position that the City will not agree to the allocated cost to the City as identified in the cooperative agreement to the extent that any item where the amount does not satisfy the above portion of statutory provision. He will sign the agreement today as long as there is a provision in there that the County will pick up any amounts they would lose if challenged.

Commissioner Rettman asked if the County has ever done that in the 30-year countywide policy.

Mr. Haider responded negatively. The County does not underwrite the cities attempt to assess.

Commissioner Rettman asked what makes this different than when putting it through any other municipality in this County that is bearing a huge amount. Drainage is not just about that property, it is for a much bigger concept. She cited the flooding in Falcon Heights, and how much impact drainage can have.

Mr. Watson said the Board should ratify this project if it is believed there is value to be realized to the taxpayers in Ramsey County to the extent of \$5.4 million. He has to establish that there is a value to the taxpayers of this community – either the eight parcel owners or 1300 homeowners to the extent of \$242,000, and they are also going to be part of the school district distribution, which is another several hundred thousand dollars.

Commissioner Rettman asked if the school district has signed off.

Mr. Watson said it is his understanding that they have not formally signed off.

Jim Tolaas, Public Works Department, answered that they have signed off on the easement but not the cost participation for the drainage portion.

Commissioner Bennett asked if the \$180,000 would normally have gone through the City, but it was split off from the City and the school district is taking care of it themselves.

Mr. Watson said that was discussed with them a couple of years ago about how they would like that handled for just that reason. The City engineer told them that to the extent of trying to assess for drainage matters, challenges are very hard to defend on the part of the City. Most often the property owner will win on a challenge with the City having the deep pockets to write the check for the difference. Approvals have been obtained from the religious properties; they all want to see the project advance, though they reserve the right to negotiate the price.

Commissioner Haigh clarified that the City of North Oaks wants to go forward with this project. However, the dilemma is trying to figure out how to pay the \$242,000.

Mr. Watson said that is correct. He reviewed the budget information within the handouts impacting just the east side of the road totaling about \$400,000. There are North Oaks Council Members who cannot justify those numbers for the piece of road involved. He would recommend that the City approve the Cooperative Agreement with terms laid out in the handouts, and with a budget allocated to the City with items listed for a total of \$96,281. As Mayor, after receipt of an acceptable Cooperative Agreement, a special meeting would be called to act on the matter. Regional dollars should be pumped into these kinds of roads, the benefit is clearly a regional benefit, and the financing principle of such a highway construction project needs to be changed.

Mr. Watson stated that benefit and cost need to be correlated. The City Council is trying to make a good budget relative to the value exchange, which will be judgmental. They would like a third party to referee that. This is done in the spirit of cooperation. He commended Jim Tolaas for his cooperation and hard work.

Commissioner Reinhardt thanked Mr. Watson for his presentation. It appears there is much agreement and everyone wants to go forward with the project. She believes there are two major issues. One is part of the indemnification language that was accepted for Highway 96. It seems as

(Continued)

though that can be worked out. As to the funding formulas that come from the State and the County, they won't be changed by a vote on the County Board. It doesn't sound as though there is an argument with the Cooperative Agreement. The argument comes with the amount of money and how it will be assessed. With the dispute on the amount, that should be worked out with the engineer as to what it should be. This can't be done with a lesser standard than what is accepted at the State level.

Commissioner Reinhardt suggested discussions with substantiation for the costs. This is only one of many projects that need to move forward, and this one is high priority. As to the indemnification, the County is not going to put itself in that position, it will not pick up the costs because that is not something under State law or the way it has been done in the past. The indemnification language should be worked out similar to what was done on Highway 96, some reasonable numbers put together, and bring it to the City Council.

Mr. Watson said this was approved in December, and at that time the City was told by County Public Works that they were not in a position to negotiate anything with the City. That is why this item is at the Board level now. He does not agree that this is a policy issue. Rather, it is a case of having over-engineered the design; as a result, the budget is too high. Some things are being proposed that aren't imperative to the road itself, the delineation of some of the drainage areas aren't required, and as a result, if the budget is reduced, some of these costs aren't allocated and attributed. The school district will benefit as well as the religious property owners. They will probably not assess drainage to the City of North Oaks generally.

Mr. Watson said this budget is too big; the allocations of what needs to be allocated are fine as a policy. Drainage is the major issue, other than challenging the policy question, which may be more someone's recommendation as to how to attribute residual value to a signal that has usual life remaining.

Commissioner Reinhardt said direction would then be to look at the numbers with a professional assessment, not picking numbers out of the air to help with the situation as far as assessing those numbers. She asked Mr. Watson if the budget comes back after a look by County engineers and Mr. Roos, and it was determined for an appropriate budget, would the City approve that.

Mr. Watson replied if they can find a place to substantiate these issues he would recommend those to the City Council.

Commissioner Bennett said this affects not just North Oaks, but the school district, and Shoreview as well. Part of the problem is that this needs to go to bid within about 3-4 weeks or the signal won't be completed for the next school year. Many people consider it a very dangerous intersection. There have been many public meetings and planning sessions. If the costs are reduced here, Shoreview has already publicly stated they want their costs reduced. The school district may want their costs reduced. If the issue is just down to the costs for the drainage portion, and cities are responsible for some of their drainage problems, it might be time for a third party engineer to review the prices and live with that. As to the signal system, this is a new assessment and the only entity entitled to ask for money back is the grocery store.

Commissioner Rettman said the total construction costs for this project are estimated at \$5.3 million, with right of way costs adding \$1 million. The County is eligible for approximately \$4.3 million from CSAH dollars: Shoreview at \$722,000; North Oaks at \$242,000; the school district at \$234,000 offset by easement compensation. If the bids come in different and there is a way to change the drainage that will be done. She moved that the project proceed to stay with the cost

(Continued)

allocations. She is fine if there is a way to do some of the things Commissioners Reinhardt and Bennett have spoken of, but she does not want to slow this project down by losing another year. This would be taking a rural section and turning it into an urban roadway, which is one of the clear and compelling evidences included in this project.

Commissioner Rettman moved going forward on this with cost allocations in affect utilizing better bids that may be obtained or with other adjustments, seconded by Commissioner Haigh.

Commissioner Bennett said North Oaks has stated they won't pay. He asked what would happen to the project.

Commissioners Reinhardt and Wiessner responded that the project doesn't go forward.

Commissioner Wiessner asked if staff has heard all this discussion, and whether no compromise has been reached.

Mr. Haider said staff has only heard general statements such as those today that the drainage areas are improperly delineated. To his knowledge, there has been no attempt to bring any technical data to bear on that issue, leaving the choice of using the information that staff has. That is what will be used to determine the cost sharing, which will not change unless Mr. Roos comes in with something different than what has been 'softly' talked about at Council meetings in the past. As the Mayor pointed out, an inordinate amount of time has been spent looking at alternatives bringing forth plans and discussions about this project. There has been no technical response to that which is the arena the County Public Works staff deals with. If some definitive information is provided regarding drainage areas that can reduce the costs to the project, staff would do that, but it is late in the project. That is about the only area for latitude.

Staff does not consider the issue with the signal system 'on the table'. It would be difficult to give a rebate to citizens who never paid for the first signal. The signal was inherited, the County owns it, maintains it, and now a brand new signal is being putting in, charging it off the normal way a signal would be charged.

Mr. Haider hopes there is not an expectation on the part of the Board as a result of the motion that there is going be some major movement.

Commissioner Bennett asked Mr. Haider if it is feasibly possible with the documentation to show why this can't be done.

Mr. Haider responded absolutely.

Commissioner Bennett asked Mr. Watson if a written response could be obtained from Mr. Roos similar to the proposal from the Public Works Department. Is it possible in the short period of time for a third party chosen by both City and County to look at both proposals? Adding this in will now drive up the costs.

Mr. Haider said there is already some third-party involvement by the drainage allocation from the State. The State reviews the information put together by the County, and then does their evaluation. The agreement stipulates that the drainage memo from the State is what will prevail as far as what is eligible, which identifies the County's share of the cost, with the remainder going to what the cities and local entities would pay for. What have been lost in this discussion is the actual costs which will be based on the bid prices, not on the estimates that are in the agreement at this point in time. If there is a concern that inflated engineer's estimates have been used, that would be taken care of by the fact that the County will use bid numbers from the actual contractor based on the actual cost of those items, to modify the amounts in the agreement, which may go up or down.

Commissioner Bennett said the City is challenging the County, and asked if they could submit their numbers to the State, letting the State make the choice.

(Continued)

Mr. Watson commented said this is the County's project. The City is trying to find a way to work with the County.

Commissioner Bennett said this is not a County project. It is a project for the citizens of Ramsey County.

Mr. Watson said everyone is part of that citizen process, which is a project carried on by Ramsey County. If it had been a road project initiated by the City of North Oaks, there would be a different set of responsibilities including budget and finance. They are not suggesting that they are asking for a rebate on the signal system. He is suggesting that Chapter 429 be followed as on all other projects.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the motion addresses most of the issues; and Mr. Roos will look at the numbers. The State is in the process of doing that. If there is some reason to change it then she assumes that it will be changed. The motion is not getting down to a traffic signal versus drainage in one portion and not another.

Mr. Watson said he is objecting that a third party engineer look at this and then all the material be submitted to Mn/DOT. He will not recommend the City spending five cents going to Mn/DOT on the County's project.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the attempt was being made to give Mr. Watson some comfort level by having a third party, to deal with his concerns. She asked if there was some language accessible on Highway 96 regarding indemnification.

Mr. Tolaas, Project Manager, Public Works Department, said the only change made on Highway 96 was to delete North Oaks from the indemnification provision. That includes all the communities that have a leg entering into that signal. In the case of Highway 96, Shoreview and Vadnais Heights had to pick up where North Oaks opted out, sending the agreements back to the communities of Vadnais Heights and Shoreview. It doesn't put additional responsibility upon Ramsey County, rather upon the other communities. They agreed and approved those documents given the importance of those projects.

Commissioner Rettman said Commissioner Wiessner had stated this wouldn't go forward if it is not approved. She said the County is prepared to go to bid under the same cost allocation, we will minimize fiscally any possible any of the concerns enumerated, that we stand behind our cost participation, and would like to move forward submit to their approval, and payment of the document. The County will not micro manage how the City of North Oaks manages their \$242,000. If the City chooses not to go forward, the project will not go forward, and moved this as a friendly amendment. Commissioner Haigh as seconder accepted that amendment.

Commissioner Bennett asked Commissioner Rettman what date should be put in the motion.

Commissioner Rettman said the documentation states that timing and construction staging for this project are now critical. Advertisement for bids must go forward in early February to ensure work staged for the 2002 construction can be completed prior to the fall freeze-up.

Commissioner Bennett clarified that he is looking for a solution because the big issue seems to be the cost on the drainage. There is no documentation from Mr. Roos, which is needed, in writing. The argument is the County's numbers are wrong, the engineers are wrong and it is done wrong. The County's plan must be submitted to the State for final approval. If this was reduced to what we've been told Mr. Roos has said, that would have to be submitted to the State from the City, which could veto the project if they don't agree with it.

Mr. Tolaas said the agreement specifies the hydraulics memorandum, which is what governs and makes it eligible or non-eligible so that binds the County.

(Continued)

Commissioner Bennett said the legitimate solution is that the County needs to hear from North Oaks and their engineer.

Commissioner Reinhardt said because of the time sensitivity on this, the motion should be made final today. The motion is to proceed and that the County is open to discussion within a short time frame to look at the costs to try to make sure they are what we believe they should be.

Commissioner Bennett asked Mr. Watson if he could meet the timeline for February 5 to have Mr. Roos produce the paper and have the North Oaks City Council meet by that date?

Mr. Watson said he could call a special meeting with a three-day notice.

Commissioner Bennett asked if the date could be extended.

Mr. Haider responded it is more complicated than that in order to meet publication dates suggesting going to Friday, February 8.

Mr. Watson said with materials in hand that would work with a three-day notice for a meeting.

Commissioner Reinhardt said timing is critical. She asked the County engineers present if all the agreements have to be in place before letting the bids – what if the County decides not to go forward with the project.

Mr. Haider responded that the County has the option to reject all bids but if the project were withdrawn, the County would not be playing by the rules when the contractors have spent so much time in putting the bids together.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the rest of the timing is regarding the City of North Oaks and Mr. Roos in coming up with a counter-argument.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7.
Nays – 0. (2002-024)

Chair McDonough thanked Mr. Watson for his presentation.

WHEREAS, There is broad support for the reconstruction of Highway 49 between Bridge Street and Birch Lane South; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County Department of Public Works has prepared a Cooperative Agreement with the City of North Oaks; and

WHEREAS, The cost sharing identified in said Agreement is consistent with the County's Cost Participation Policy; and

WHEREAS, The City of North Oaks will not enter into said Agreement as currently prepared; Now, Therefore Be It

RESOLVED, By the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners that the project proceed on its current schedule; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Cost Participation Policy will be used to prepare the Cooperative Agreement for this project; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The City of North Oaks will present written alternative drainage area determinations prepared by the City Engineer that reduce the cost share for the City; and Be It Further

(Continued)

RESOLVED, The City of North Oaks will provide all additional cost sharing information as soon as possible for County review; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, If the cooperative agreements are not executed on or before February 8, 2002, the project will not proceed

PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE – Joint Powers Agreement between Ramsey County and Washington County for Property Tax Payment Processing by Ramsey County

Commissioner Bennett commented that this is good government.

Dorothy McClung, Director, Property Records and Revenue, said discussion has taken place for four years about how Ramsey and Washington Counties can work more cooperatively to save money. National cash register (NCR) machines to process tax payments were purchased in 1996. When tax payments come in, they are matched to make sure the amount on the check is the same as the stub, then sent through the NCR machines putting on coding for bank routing purposes. It processes the check and updates the tax system so all the payments are registered and dated. About 98% of all checks received in any one day are totally processed and deposited within that day's time.

Prior to 1996, it could take weeks and sometimes months to process all the May 15 and October 15 payments. In 2000 the Department processed over \$550,000 in tax payments and assessments, with almost \$1 billion processed with other payments. Most of the mail arrives in the morning and is in the bank in the afternoon. By having the money in the bank, it becomes available for investment by the County. Because of this ability, Ramsey County is the envy of many other counties. With the ability to code the checks, it saves the County \$.025 per check; the fees from the bank are reduced because the County is performing some of the work previously done by the bank.

Ramsey County integrated a new tax system in 2000, which is the same tax system as Washington County, which increased opportunities for collaborative projects. Because of Ramsey's excess capacity, discussion has been held with Washington County to process their payments. Staff from both counties are confident this can be done exactly the same. It should save Washington County staff time, and increase their investment opportunities.

A joint powers agreement (JPA) is being looked at that would provide a pilot project for the year 2002. All tax payments Washington County receives between the weeks of April 22 through May 31 and again September 23 through October 31 would be processed by Ramsey County. The cost to Washington County would be 50 cents per parcel -- 25 cents for a processing fee and the other 25 cents for imaging each of the documents and maintaining the imaging equipment. It is expected that 92,000 payments will be processed for an approximate payment of \$46,000 from Washington County this year.

Rice and Olmsted Counties have contacted Ramsey County wanting this process this year, but were told Ramsey needs a year to make sure this will work well. Ramsey County can more than cover its costs, pay for the cost of the imaging equipment making a digital image for ease of research on-line, when needed. Ramsey County will make some money and save Washington County some money.

Commissioner Reinhardt said this is a fantastic idea.

Commissioner Reinhardt moved that a joint powers agreement be brought back to this Board, seconded by Commissioner Wiessner.

(Continued)

Commissioner Wiessner said this is a win-win for everyone. She asked if enough is being built into the cost of it so that Ramsey County comes out ahead.

Ms. McClung said that is something that has to be looked at very carefully. Staff will keep track of time, will decide if additional hours were needed from temporary staff brought in during those periods of time, and exactly what those costs are involved. That is why this is a pilot project.

Commissioner Wiessner asked about the capacity.

Ms. McClung said even on the busiest days – May 16 and October 16 – the machines are probably not used 50% of the time – staff are completed with their processing by approximately noon.

Commissioner Wiessner said eventually a new machine will come along that is faster and better. She asked if the cost for depreciation and replacement is built in.

Ms. McClung said this year the imaging component will be added to that machine, and will make Ramsey County more efficient. Staff are looking at how to set up money to make sure there is money to replace the equipment keeping it up to date.

Commissioner Haigh said as the agreement is drafted a good analysis of costs will be needed, and that a fee schedule representing true costs should be established. She would like that type of detail when this returns with the JPA.

Ms. McClung said the department will come back on February 5 with the JPA. That detail will not be available at that time. The data will be gathered throughout the year. They are confident that the 50 cents per parcel will cover all the direct costs. Both counties will be looking at the indirect costs, how to plan for replacement of equipment – and whether or not 50 cents per parcel is enough.

Ms. McClung said the detail of how that is based on costs is not known at this time.

Commissioner Haigh said cost information is important when government becomes entrepreneurial. The County needs to do pricing just like a private business would do product pricing. It is important to gain expertise from the private sector on how that is done if the capability is not available in-house. Staff needs to look at the County's internal audit function to assist with pricing or look at some other private sector resource.

Ms. McClung said that was a very good suggestion. In her experience, governmental agencies are not great at cost accounting in the business sense, but as these types of transactions are entered into County staff does need to learn more, probably from outside sources. Government needs to learn to look at costs that same way.

Commissioner Rettman would like the Joint Powers Agreement to include verbiage that indicates that costs must be reviewed in order to continue with the process. It should clearly state that this is the first year of this project and that all costs will be covered. She also requested that when this item returns to the Board that the issue of temporary staff be addressed. With the potential budget cuts, she would like to be confident that before temporary employees are hired, accommodations are made to retrain other employees.

Ms. McClung said the proposed Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) will be in force for 2002 only and is a pilot project. Staff understands that both Ramsey and Washington County will gather cost and benefit data.

Commissioner Rettman said she would prefer that the language be in the JPA if an Assistant County Attorney can figure out a way to have it there.

Ms. McClung said the Department does not anticipate hiring staff over and above those brought in to do the processing. No additional employees will be hired. It is likely that the same group of temporary employees who do Ramsey County's processing will do the processing for Washington County. No costs over and above the regular processing costs are anticipated.

(Continued)

Commissioner Rettman asked for additional information on these temporary employees. Ms. McClung will provide such information.

Chair McDonough asked the difference in bringing this to the Board as a fee for service contract versus a Joint Powers Agreement.

Ms. McClung said staff decided a Joint Powers Agreement between two governmental entities was the best way to go.

Karen Kushner, Assistant County Attorney, said State statute says that when two governmental entities are doing the same thing or when one governmental entity is doing the same thing that another entity could do for itself, that they enter into a Joint Powers Agreement approved by the governing bodies of the entities.

Chair McDonough asked if they could choose to contract out what they are already doing to another governmental entity that is doing the same service without doing a Joint Powers Agreement.

Ms. Kushner said that whether it is called a fee for service or a joint powers agreement, the important part is that the governing bodies must approve it.

Chair McDonough said he wants to make certain that Ramsey County has control over how this project is managed. A joint powers agreement tends to give the impression that there is input from the other entity, and that Washington County could have a say into how the system works. He wants to make certain that Ramsey County is in complete control and decides if it will work, how it will work, and under what terms and conditions.

Ms. Kushner said she would not change how it has been drafted whether it is called a joint powers agreement or a fee for service contract.

Commissioner Ortega said the issue is not so much between Ramsey and Washington Counties, but if this is a successful project and several other counties want to become involved there could be an issue.

Ms. Kushner said there is no requirement for the creation of a new joint powers board and that it could be called a contract for fee.

Commissioner Ortega believes the Department will be very successful with this project. He asked if there is capacity for other counties to be included.

Ms. McClung said that the proposed Joint Powers Agreement is written very clearly that Ramsey County's work comes first. Staff will process Ramsey County's payments first and only when Ramsey County's work is done will they process Washington County payments. Because of the work previously done with Washington County and because the tax systems are the same, Ramsey County should be able to handle this function for Washington County with very little increase in cost.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that when the costs are being put into this project, even though the staff is in place, part of Washington County's cost would be assessing the staffing cost back. If there is the need for an additional staff person, as long as it is included in the cost, it will be covered.

Commissioner Reinhardt amended her previous motion so that the document that comes back to the Board is a contract rather than a Joint Powers Agreement. The seconder accepted the amendment as friendly.

Commissioner Rettman said this discussion is just about the details and that this is good government. Whether it is a contract or joint powers agreement, the Board appreciates the tenacity Ms. McClung has shown in working toward this system.

Ms. McClung said that if this project works, the next one would be much easier.

(Continued)

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. An amended resolution will be on the Board Agenda of February 5, 2002.

PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-025)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County, Department of Property Records and Revenue, on behalf of the State of Minnesota, "Trust Exempt", has received four applications from the City of Maplewood to purchase four parcels of tax-forfeited land; and

WHEREAS, These properties are located in the City of Maplewood, County of Ramsey, and are legally described as follows:

Lots 16 through 19, inclusive, Block 14, St. Aubin and Dion's Rice Street Addition to the City of St Paul, Ramsey Co., Minn., together with that part of the West ½ of the vacated alley accruing thereto by reason of the vacation thereof. Subject to rights of the County of Ramsey in and to the South 15 feet of Lot 16 of said Block 14 acquired by Final Certificate filed as Doc. No. 1833850 in the office of the Ramsey County Recorder. Also subject to Resolution filed as Doc. No. 1298854 in said office of the County Recorder.

PIN: 18-29-22-34-0076; and

Lot 20, inclusive, Block 14, St. Aubin and Dion's Rice Street Addition to the City of St Paul, Ramsey Co., Minn., together with that part of the West ½ of the vacated alley accruing thereto by reason of the vacation thereof. Also subject to Resolution filed as Doc. No. 1298854 in said office of the County Recorder.

PIN: 18-29-22-34-0077; and

Lot 21, inclusive, Block 14, St. Aubin and Dion's Rice Street Addition to the City of St Paul, Ramsey Co., Minn., together with that part of the West ½ of the vacated alley accruing thereto by reason of the vacation thereof. Also subject to Resolution filed as Doc. No. 1298854 in said office of the County Recorder.

PIN: 18-29-22-34-0078; and

Lot 22, inclusive, Block 14, St. Aubin and Dion's Rice Street Addition to the City of St Paul, Ramsey Co., Minn., together with that part of the West ½ of the vacated alley accruing thereto by reason of the vacation thereof. Also subject to Resolution filed as Doc. No. 1298854 in said office of the County Recorder.

PIN: 18-29-22-34-0079; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Property Records and Revenue proposes to sell four tax-forfeited parcels to the City of Maplewood for the total appraised value of \$7,000.00, plus other applicable fees and costs; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, The City of Maplewood, Minnesota wishes to acquire these four properties for drainage and storm water ponding purposes as prescribed by the Maplewood Comprehensive Storm Water plan; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the sale of each of these four above-described tax-forfeited properties to the City of Maplewood for the total appraised value of \$7,000.00, plus applicable fees and costs.

PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE – Review of Use Deed application for a tax forfeited property in accordance with the targeted neighborhood requirements to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of Saint Paul, Minnesota, a political subdivision.

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-026)

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, "Trust Exempt"; and

WHEREAS, The property is described as follows:

Lot 19, Block 5, Edmund Rice's First Addition to St. Paul
PIN: 29-29-22-32-0044
PA: 881 Desoto Street, Saint Paul MN 55101-4233
COMMISSIONER DISTRICT: 3
FORFEITED: August 1, 2001; and

WHEREAS, The Tax Forfeited Lands section has determined that the parcel is located in a targeted neighborhood, as defined in Minn. Statute Section 469.201, subd. 10, and within an eligible census tract, as defined by City Council Resolution #90-567; and

WHEREAS, The Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul intends to use the property as a site 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 or redevelopment; and

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

(Continued)

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners has received and 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

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby directs the Department of Property Records and Revenue to make application to the Department of Revenue to obtain a Use Deed, for the purpose of constructing a new home, to the Housing and Redevelopment Authority of the City of St. Paul for the property located at 881 Desoto Street, PIN: 29-29-22-32-0044.

PUBLIC WORKS – Agreement for Professional Services for the Reconstruction of Silver Lake Road

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-027)

WHEREAS, The reconstruction of Silver Lake Road between 15th Street, N.W. and County Road H is listed in the Ramsey County Public Works Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, The Public Works Department issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to the twelve consultant firms identified on the County's pre-qualified list in accordance with Ramsey County Resolution 99-121; and

WHEREAS, A consultant selection committee consisting of representatives from the Public Works Department reviewed proposals submitted by the pre-qualified consultants; and

WHEREAS, The consultant selection committee was unanimous in their selection of Bolton & Menk, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, Professional Services Agreement PW2001-19 between Ramsey County and Bolton & Menk, Inc. has been drafted and outlines the services Bolton & Menk, Inc. will provide; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves Professional Services Agreement PW2001-19 with Bolton & Menk, Inc. for the design of a reconstruction project on Silver Lake Road between 15th Street N.W. and County Road H at the cost of \$208,490.00; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Chair and Chief Clerk to execute Agreement PW2001-19 on behalf of Ramsey County; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The sixteen (16) page Agreement will be kept on file with the Chief Clerk; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, the Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the following budget adjustment:

(Continued)

INCREASE ESTIMATED REVENUE

2002	11101	550880	314617	Engineering Fee Reimbursement	P033128	\$208,490.00
------	-------	--------	--------	----------------------------------	---------	--------------

TRANSFER TO APPROPRIATION

2002	11101	550880	442109	Professional Services	P033128	\$208,490.00
------	-------	--------	--------	-----------------------	---------	--------------

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to approve and make the necessary budget adjustments for the payment of the incentive bonus in accordance with the terms of Agreement PW2001-19.

PUBLIC HEALTH – POS Agreement Renewal with Northwest Youth and Family Services for the 2002 calendar year

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-028)

WHEREAS, Saint Paul Community Agencies and Clinics provide primary health care, health promotion, dental, family planning and supportive social services to Ramsey County residents in need of low cost health care; and

WHEREAS, Northwest Youth and Family Services provides social services to Ramsey County residents, Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the Purchase of Service Agreement with Northwest Youth and Family Services, 3490 Lexington Avenue North, Shoreview, MN 55112, for \$32,849 for the period January 1, 2002 through December 31, 2002; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to execute the Agreement on behalf of Ramsey County.

PUBLIC HEALTH – MN Department of Human Services Child & Teen Check-up grant awarded to Ramsey County

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-029)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County has received a Child & Teen Check-up grant award of \$1,036,209 from the Minnesota Department of Human Services; and

WHEREAS, The grant award includes \$50,000 in funding for a clinic nurse to provide Child & Teen Check-up outreach and educational services at the Immigrant and Refugee Clinic conducted by the St Paul Ramsey County Department of Public Health; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, The educational and outreach services to be provided by this clinic nurse would be additional services not currently provided; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Board approves the increase in the complement of the Saint Paul – Ramsey County Department of Public Health of 1.0 FTE Clinic Nurse, to be “starred” in the budget; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to make any necessary budget adjustments.

PUBLIC HEALTH – Request for additional 2.0 FTE Public Health Nurse II starred positions, supported by revenue, for current case management services and to assist with anticipated increased need for services

Commissioner Ortega introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-030)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County Community Human Services contracts with Saint Paul-Ramsey County Department of Public Health for the Minnesota Department of Human Services programs of Long Term Care Consultation and case management services for persons eligible for Alternative Care, Elderly Waiver, Community Alternatives for Disabled Individuals, and Traumatic Brain Injury Waiver; and

WHEREAS, The case management client case load in Public Health has increased by 79 clients over the number projected in 2002 revenue calculations, and the amount of case management time spent on each client continues to be at a higher level; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota has made several initiatives available to people to provide home and community based supports for elderly and disabled individuals which may increase the Public Health caseload for screening and case management for individuals receiving services under these initiatives; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota Department of Human Services will directly reimburse the Department for case management services to eligible clients; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the addition of 2.0 FTE Public Health Nurse II positions to the Public Health Department complement to be starred in the budget and contingent on continued funding; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to make budget adjustments, which are necessary in the 2002 budget to implement this increase in funding; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to accept any supplemental additions to this funding should they become available.

(Continued)

PROPERTY RECORDS AND REVENUE – One application to purchase a tax forfeited parcel by the Minnesota Department of Transportation, a government agency

Commissioner Wiessner introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Commissioner Wiessner said the map enclosed in the documentation is difficult to read and asked where the parcel is located.

Kristine Kujala, Tax Forfeited Land, Property Records and Revenue, said the property is located in the middle of Interstate 94. Mn/DOT also owns the parcel to which this parcel is attached. Mn/DOT were under the assumption that they owned this small parcel.

Commissioner Wiessner asked if there are any other privately owned parcels under I94.

Ms. Kujala did not know the answer to that question.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7.
Nays – 0. (2002-031)

WHEREAS, Ramsey County, Department of Property Records and Revenue, on behalf of the State of Minnesota, "Trust Exempt", has received an application from the Minnesota Department of Transportation to purchase a parcel of tax-forfeited land; and

WHEREAS, This property is located in the City of Saint Paul, County of Ramsey, and is legally described as follows:

"That part of Lot 24, Block 59, Irvine's Enlargement of Rice and Irvine's Addition to the town of Saint Paul, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the Northwestern line of said Lot 24, distant 25 feet Southwesterly of the most Northerly corner of said Lot 24; thence Southeasterly, parallel with the Northeasterly line of said Lot 24, a distance of 133.36 feet; thence Northeasterly, parallel with the Southeasterly line of said Lot 24, to a point distant 0.5 feet Southwesterly of the Northeasterly line of said Lot 24; thence Southeasterly, parallel with the Northeasterly line of said Lot 24, to the Southeasterly line of said Lot 24; thence Southwesterly, along the Southeasterly line of said Lot 24, to the Southwesterly line of said Lot 24; thence Northwesterly, along the Southwesterly line of said Lot 24, to the Northwestern line of said Lot 24; thence Northeasterly, along the Northwestern line of said Lot 24, to the point of beginning; which lies Northeasterly of the following described line: Beginning at a point on the Northwestern line of said Lot 24, distant 15 feet Southwesterly of the most Northerly corner of said Lot 24; thence Southeasterly to a point on the Northwestern line of Lot 15, said Block 59, Distant 15 feet Southwesterly of the most Northerly corner of said Lot 15 and there terminating.

PIN: 06-28-22-22-0001

PA: Mulberry Street, St. Paul, MN 55102

COMMISSIONER DISTRICT 5; and

WHEREAS, The Director of Property Records and Revenue proposes to sell a tax-forfeited parcel to the Minnesota Department of Transportation for the appraised value of \$50.00, plus other applicable fees and costs; and

WHEREAS, The Department of Transportation wishes to acquire the parcel for Highway right-of-way purposes; Now, Therefore, Be It

(Continued)

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the sale of the above-described tax-forfeited property to the Minnesota Department of Transportation for the appraised value of \$50.00, plus applicable fees and costs.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Scholarship Program – Ramsey Nursing Home Employees

Commissioner Wiessner introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

Commissioner Wiessner asked how many employees this program could serve annually.

Patricia Reller, Administrator, Ramsey Nursing Home, said a total of about \$16,000 would be available annually for this scholarship program. Internal limits of approximately \$2,500 per employee have been established. There are additional requirements from the Department of Human Services.

Commissioner Wiessner asked how the money would be divided if all employees decided to apply for it.

Ms. Reller said criteria has been established and states the employee must be working at least half time, must have been working at the nursing home for at least one year, cannot have been suspended within one year of application, etc. The committee would then meet and look at performance, work record and career goals, and if the employee is looking for continued employment, hopefully with the County.

Commissioner Wiessner asked if the education must be tied to health services.

Ms. Reller said regulations within the bulletin the Nursing Home received from the Department of Human Services states the education needs to be in the area of long-term health care.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7.
Nays – 0. (2002-032)

WHEREAS, The 2001 Minnesota Legislature provided additional funding to nursing homes to establish a scholarship program for their employees; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey Nursing Home will receive approximately \$16,000 annually through a \$.25 per day increase in their per diem for this purpose; and

WHEREAS, In response, the Ramsey Nursing Home set up an internal Scholarship Committee that has developed recommended criteria for eligibility and distribution of the funds for the program; and

WHEREAS, Eligible employees would be all staff, excluding the Administrator and Registered Nurses, and the maximum scholarship amount would be \$2,500 per year; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Board of Ramsey County Commissioners hereby authorizes the County Manager to make all necessary budget adjustments to increase estimated revenues and appropriations for the Scholarship Program for Ramsey Nursing Home employees.

(Continued)

PUBLIC HEALTH – Community Clinic Funding

Commissioner Haigh introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Rettman.

Commissioner Haigh asked for an overview of this funding because this is the first time with this new process. She also asked if the City of Saint Paul funding is reflected in the numbers provided.

Jane Norbin, Director, Health Policy & Planning, Department of Public Health, said the City of Saint Paul CDBG money is included in these numbers.

Commissioner Haigh if those numbers substantially remained the same.

Ms. Norbin responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Haigh asked if those numbers are negotiated.

Ms. Norbin responded affirmatively. Staff followed the direction of the Board to find a way to fund clinics on a performance basis rather than a grant basis, and that a capped amount of money is allocated to each clinic. The dollar amounts for the clinics were based on percentages of uninsured visits in 2000. The figures from the year 2000 were used because at the time this was being negotiated, those were the most recent figures available. Based on the percentage that each clinic saw in 2000, an amount was allocated to them. The clinics will not automatically receive the amount stated in the contract. The contract states the amount as a maximum amount, but each clinic must earn its dollars. They will earn dollars by reporting visits to the County. The County has the ability to audit the clinics if needed. A check will be given to each clinic on a quarterly basis based upon the number of visits by uninsured Ramsey County residents.

Commissioner Haigh asked if the numbers reflect increased activity at some of the clinics versus other clinics.

Ms. Norbin responded affirmatively and said that some clinics are seeing a slight decrease in the maximum amount available to them because they were not doing as much work for Ramsey County. Other clinics are seeing a slight increase. Built into the contract is a type of “fail safe”, in that during any year the clinics cannot be paid less than 90% of the previous year’s funding. That accounts for any market variation or something not within the control of the clinic. If, over the years, the clinic sees fewer and fewer uninsured visits the amount they earn would be less and less.

Commissioner Haigh asked if negotiations would continue to take place with two-year-old data.

Ms. Norbin said the numbers will only be two quarters behind. After the contracts are approved, the County will make payment for visits the clinics saw in the third quarter of 2001.

Commissioner Haigh requested clarification that the amounts are then based on annual figures for 2000, but the actual payments will be two quarters behind.

Ms. Norbin answered affirmatively and said the payments will reflect the actual work done. It was necessary to find a figure that could be placed in the contracts as a maximum. The actual payment will always be based on work performed.

Commissioner Rettman said the clinics have worked hard on this issue and that Ms. Norbin has worked extremely hard to do what this Board set forth. The clinics need to be complimented along with Ms. Norbin in terms of getting to the point of accountability and documentation and where as many people as possible are put on MnCare and other opportunities. She asked Ms. Norbin to tell the clinics that the Board appreciates the efforts the clinics put in on this issue.

Commissioner Rettman said that Model Cities Health Clinic includes the North End Clinic but that name doesn’t show up on the documentation or resolution. She said the dollars reflect the North End Clinic getting some dollars as well.

(Continued)

Commissioner Rettman requested an amendment to the resolution and contract that states “Model Cities Health Clinic, also doing business as North End Clinic”.

This amendment was accepted as friendly.

Ms. Norbin said that wording could be included in the resolution and the contract. She said they are eligible to earn more than Model Cities earned last year.

Commissioner Ortega asked how the baseline was established.

Ms. Norbin said staff took the number of visits and allocated a percentage of uninsured people seen by each clinic. The minimum would be 90% of that amount and the maximum would be 120% of that amount. The clinics will be paid quarterly based on the amount of visits. If they reach the end of the year and have not yet reached the minimum, they will receive the additional amount due them, which is the minimum. The following year, the maximum would be less if they didn't reach the minimum the previous year. The base could be affected in a subsequent year.

Commissioner Haigh said that the next time this comes back, she would appreciate a report on the policy agenda on how this system is working.

Roll Call on amended resolution: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-033)

WHEREAS, The Saint Paul Community Clinics provide primary medical, dental and mental health care to low income, uninsured residents of Ramsey County; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners desires to assist the clinics in the provision of this care, Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to execute the 2002 contracts with the following Ramsey County community clinics:

- Family Tree, Inc., 1619 Dayton Ave., St. Paul, MN 55106, maximum contract payment of \$148,406;
- Face-to-Face Face Health and Counseling Center, 1165 Arcade, St. Paul, MN 55106, maximum contract payment of \$148,406;
- Model Cities Health Clinic, also doing business as North End Clinic, 430 N. Dale, St. Paul, MN 55103, maximum contract payment of \$315,959;
- Health Start, 491 University Ave, St. Paul, MN 55103 maximum contract payment of \$139,340;and
- West Side Community Health Services, 153 Concord Street, St. Paul, MN 55107, maximum contract payment of \$280,069, and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to enter into and execute a contract with the City of Saint Paul for year 2002 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds.

PUBLIC HEALTH – MN Department of Children, Families and Learning After-School Enrichment Grant

Commissioner Haigh introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt.

(Continued)

Commissioner Haigh asked if Summit U/Frogtown decided to do its own fiscal work and not have Ramsey County do it for them any longer. If so, do they still receive funding?

Rob Fulton, Director, Public Health, responded affirmatively. They receive the money but it doesn't come through Ramsey County.

Commissioner Haigh requested funding information on Summit U/Frogtown and would like a copy of their application.

Mr. Fulton said he would provide her with that information.

Commissioner Bennett referred to grants that have a hold on them by the State, and asked if the grant would be issued prior to the County loaning any dollars.

Mr. Fulton responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Wiessner asked if this money would be available to the Suburban Ramsey Family Collaborative.

Mr. Fulton said this money is earmarked for neighborhoods defined as distressed. It was originally designated specifically for Saint Paul but has now been expanded to other cities.

Chair McDonough said he has a potential conflict on this item because he is a member of the Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff Collaborative Governing Board. He was part of the process in applying for this grant and assists in reviewing the proposals within that collaborative. He stated he needs to abstain from voting on this issue.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh – 6. Nays – 0. Abstain – McDonough – 1. (2002-034)

WHEREAS, Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning made competitive two year grants available to local community based collaboratives for the purpose of providing after-school enrichment activities for school-aged youth who are not involved in after-school programming or who are struggling with academic success or who are/have been involved with the criminal justice system; and

WHEREAS, Priority neighborhoods targeted for funding in St Paul are Summit-University, Thomas-Dale, North End, Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff, and the West Side; and

WHEREAS, The following collaboratives submitted grant applications by the August 31, 2001 deadline: North End, Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff, and the West Side; and

WHEREAS, The following collaboratives requested Ramsey County to continue serving as fiscal agent for Years six and seven of this program: North End, Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff, and the West Side; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County has served as Fiscal Agent for North End/Payne-Phalen/Dayton's Bluff Collaborative; Summit-University/Thomas Dale Collaborative, and West Side Collaborative in years one, two, three of this Program, and fiscal agent for Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff Collaborative, North End Collaborative, and West Side Collaborative for years four and five; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County has agreed to serve as fiscal agent for North End, Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff; Summit-University, and West Side Collaboratives for this program; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, MN Department of Children, Families and Learning announced grant awards on November 14, 2001, funding grant applications for West Side Collaborative Payne-Phalen/Dayton's Bluff Collaborative, and North End Collaborative; and

WHEREAS, The County Manager and Department of Public Health are therefore seeking Board approval to accept the grant awards and act as fiscal agent; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to accept grant awards on behalf of the local Collaboratives for the period January 1, 2002 through December 31, 2003 from the Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning up to the following amounts:

Payne Phalen/Dayton's Bluff Collaborative	\$450,000
North End Collaborative	\$320,000
West Side Collaborative	\$405,000

and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the continuance of the County's role as fiscal agent for these grants to carry out the duties of fiscal agent as set by State Grant Guidelines, and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to make necessary budget adjustments, accept supplemental awards, approve grant period extensions, and enter into all contracts necessary to implement the grants, and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes temporary cash loans from the County Revenue Fund to the grant fund, if necessary, with loans to be repaid upon receipt of cash from the State of Minnesota.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Monthly report of contracts and final payments and grant submissions that were approved during the month of December 2001

Commissioner Haigh introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Rettman.

Commissioner Haigh referred to an item within this report regarding the HRA in Duluth, Minnesota, and asked if Ramsey County is the service provider for lead abatement.

Mr. Fulton said the Department of Housing and Urban Development gave a grant to one entity, Ramsey County. Ramsey County in turn distributed it to other entities. Ramsey County is the fiscal agent for that grant. The City of Saint Paul had been doing this for a number of years.

Roll Call: Ayes – Ortega, Reinhardt, Rettman, Wiessner, Bennett, Haigh, McDonough – 7. Nays – 0. (2002-035)

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

(Continued)

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 December 2001.

OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Reinhardt reported:

- That a Ramsey County Delegation Meeting was held last week. The ratings and priorities were put together in a very succinct package and thanked staff for putting that information together. She also thanked the Commissioners for their work on ranking. There were good questions and discussion. It will be a difficult session especially given the deficit.

Commissioner Haigh reported:

- On the Joint CH/CH Meeting held last week regarding the issue of security in the Court House. Members requested additional information regarding the current allocation of expenditures for security within the Court budget. There will be continuing work on this issue.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the County Manager will work with the Sheriff regarding numbers on the security proposals.

Mr. Kirkwold said he met with representatives from the Courts, the Sheriff's Department and Building Staff regarding this issue. All provisions for security are on the table so they become part of a plan, not just an add-on to the current system. He believes there is the ability for all sides to compromise.

- The LRT Joint Powers Board met last week. The issue of dual transit ways within the Central Corridor was discussed.
- On the Solid Waste Advisory Committee Meeting. All groups were asked to put proposals on the table. The group recommended not to alter the hierarchy, which was a big step because some of the original discussion was to dismantle the current hierarchy of solid waste, which basically has reduction, reuse and recycle at the top. Source separating and organic composting was moved up on the hierarchy to support more state investment.

Commissioner Ortega reported:

- On an Hispanic Town Meeting on the West Side with Congresswoman Betty McCollum, Senator Pappas and a member of the school board. One issue that arose was about Drivers Licenses and identification for immigrants.
- He participated with the Leadership Academy.

(Continued)

Commissioner Wiessner:

- Reported that the Library Board heard a report from a contracted consultant about facility location. The consultant looked at growth patterns and population, and assumed no library was in currently in place. Thus, based on today's demographics, he showed the best locations for libraries. Some of the libraries are currently located close to an ideal location and others are not. The Library Board will be discussing this information over the next few meetings.
- Said the AMC Board met last week and newly elected AMC President Tony Bennett convened the meeting. There was discussion on District reports and legislative issues. A special District X meeting will be held January 31, 2002 to talk about transportation issues.
- Reminded the Commissioners about the upcoming Ramsey County League of Local Governments meeting.

Commissioner Bennett:

- Said there was concern from other counties about Ramsey County's security issue. No other county is doing security.

Chair McDonough reported:

- He will co-host a forum on public collection with four District Councils in his District. It will be held at Johnson High School.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Bonnie C. Jackelen, Chief Clerk – County Board