

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE, A STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

Time & Place: Friday, May 22, 2015 at 3:30 pm., Council Chambers (later moved to basement break room)

Members Present: Wagner, Gisselman, Winters, Rasmussen, Kellbach, Oberbeck, Abitz, Mielke

Excused: Nagle, Nutting, Neal

Others Present: Tipple, Jacobson, Rayala, Groat, Kujawa, Hite, Duncanson, Lindman, Peckham

Council President Wagner noted a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:40 pm. Roll call indicated 8 members present.

### **1) Budget Priorities and CIP Process**

Wagner suggested a Budget Committee facilitated by Finance Director and City Planner. The staff should be there to support the items on the CIP committee.

Winters commented that there has to be a tracking system.

Oberbeck asked what is the outcome and goals; are some of these a 'wish list?'

Winters recommended that the whole council rank the CIP items. Rasmussen replied that if only the elected officials do the ranking, there may be 11 different rankings of items. Oberbeck asked why the council wouldn't have the staff rank all of the projects that they feel need to be done.

Consensus of the Committee was that staff should not have the power in the ranking of CIP projects. They would have advisory input only.

Rasmussen felt that the entire CIP process can't be outcome based only. There are some administrative projects that will go ahead without ranking.

Oberbeck mentioned that all council members should be on the CIP committee and involved in the ranking of projects.

Consensus of the Committee was to hold one evening's meeting for staff to make presentations, about 20 minutes each, of their project recommendations.

It was noted, that within the CISM committee the staff does do ranking of the street projects.

By about mid-June, the CIP books should be prepared and distributed to Council. A council meeting will be scheduled have presentations by staff and then council will do the ranking of the projects. A part of the CIP books will contain rankings by the Mayor and the City Planner. Additionally, a Gantt chart will lay out the timeline for each project. It is anticipated to have a second meeting to review the ranking of the projects and make any changes or adjustments as necessary.

<b>NUMERICAL LIST</b>	<b>BUDGET PRIORITIES</b>	<b>POINT VALUE</b>
1	Drugs & Related Crimes	14
2	Housing Blight	6
3	Business Growth & Development	15
4	Restore Public Trust/Communication/Transparency	7
5	Repair Organization	2
6	Provide Key Services	5
7	Financial Plan for Sustainability	16
8	Infrastructure Maintenance/Timing	3
9	Safety in Community/Neighborhoods	7
10	Economic Vitality	3
11	Complete Thomas Street	3
12	Regional Transit Offerings	2
13	Mid-Range Benchmarks for: mill rate, income etc.	10
14	Accountability & Follow up in Administration	13
15	Adequate Reserve Funds	2
16	TIF Planning for Operational Revenue	6
17	Fair Taxation	6

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>TOP 10 BUDGET PRIORITIES</b>	<b>POINT VALUE</b>
1	Financial Plan for Sustainability	16
2	Business Growth & Development	15
3	Drugs & Related Crimes	14
4	Accountability & Follow Up in Administration	13
5	Mid-Range Benchmarks	10
	a. Mill Rate	--
	b. Household Income	--
	c. Unemployment Rate	--
	d. Spending per Capita	--
	e. Property valuation	--
6	Safety	7
6	Restore Public Trust/Communication/Transparency	7
7	TIF Planning for Operational Revenue	6
7	Fair Taxation	6
7	Housing Blight	6

Motion by Mielke, second by Rasmussen to adjourn. Motion carried 8-0. Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Toni Rayala