

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM COMMITTEE MINUTES
City of Rapid City, South Dakota

C/SAC -- 3rd Floor, West Conference Room
10:00 A.M., Friday, April 16, 2010

Finance Officer Jim Preston called the meeting to order at 10:00 A.M. with the following Committee members present: Aldermen Ron Kroeger, Karen Gundersen Olson, and Sam Kooiker; and City staff: Public Works Director Robert Ellis, Growth Management Director Marcia Elkins and Parks and Recreation Director Jerry Cole. Others present included City Engineer Dale Tech, Compliance Specialist Toni Broom, Community Resources Director Kevin Thom, IT Manager Russ Tiensvold, Chief Accountant Tracy Davis and Administrative Coordinator Amber Sitts. The following arrived after the meeting was called to order: Mayor Alan Hanks, Alderman Malcom Chapman, and Landscape Architect Randy Lyons.

Motion was made by Kroeger, second by Elkins and carried to **approve the minutes for March 26, 2010.**

Davis addressed the **Financial Reports** and explained that this is the first report of the year. There were no significant payments.

Broom reported on the **Capital Plan for Streets, Drainage, and MIP Projects**. She renamed the Omaha Pedestrian Street Crossing project as requested and prefaced it with Downtown Improvements. She indicated there were changes to the following projects for 2010: Downtown Improvements – Omaha Pedestrian Crossing, Robbinsdale Reconstruction Oakland, St. Andrews Reconstruction – Phase 2, and St. Cloud Street Rehabilitation. There were no changes to 2011 through 2015, and they are still in the black. Responding to Olson, Ellis indicated the change to the Robbinsdale project was to reflect actual bid award prices. Motion was made by Chapman, second by Ellis and carried to approve the Capital Plan for Streets, Drainage, and MIP Projects.

Tech addressed the **Status of Franklin and St Charles Reconstruction - 5th St to Elm** and displayed a map, which was color coded by phase. Kooiker indicated that he would like to see a program from 5th to Elm. Tech explained the areas that will be reconstructed, and Kooiker suggested assessing other areas to get them on a plan. Ellis said they can look at the condition of the streets but pointed out that the reduction in sales tax growth resulted in about \$3 million in cuts. He said the area can be added to future consideration, and Kooiker understood the areas might be on the list for a long time. Ellis agreed to add this to their future consideration list. Responding to Chapman, Ellis explained that staff is working on the global map of the city. They will get the map and the CIP book to committee members and it will be on the internet as well. Chapman pointed out that requests to CIP should be assessed first and then added to a future consideration list. Motion was made by Kooiker, second by Olson, and carried to acknowledge the report.

Preston pointed out some changes that were made to the **Government Buildings Five-Year Plan** spreadsheet. He also indicated that the East Fire Station funds have not been moved yet, but it can be done today. Preston suggested reviewing the requests and determining any changes. Chapman then questioned how software fits into Government Buildings, and Preston explained that some requests may not qualify for funds. Chapman suggested including criteria when asking for requests for funds. Kooiker recommended that the Mayor and department heads meet and bring forward a priority list. Mayor Hanks agreed that they can sit down and sort through that, and Thom indicated he anticipated additional vetting regarding his requests. Olson understood that some projects will drop off the list due to not meeting criteria and asked where the requests would next appear. Mayor Hanks said they could appear in the budget process. Elkins spoke against sending this back and said the purpose of the CIP committee was for the discussion to happen with the City Council, Planning Commission members and staff. Mayor Hanks indicated his concern that not every department director sits on the committee, so if a priority list

is made internally, then each department head has an opportunity to pitch their project. Kooiker said that there may be items on the list that do not fit the CIP role so that could be determined before it comes to CIP. Motion was made by Kooiker to continue the item to the May 21, 2010 CIP meeting. Motion died for lack of a second. Chapman agreed that we could separate items that do not apply but allow the committee to still see them. He pointed out infrastructure has changed and said that IT will be an important piece over the next decade. However, software is not necessarily government buildings. It was confirmed that all departments received the email for funding requests. Motion was made by Kroeger, second by Olson, to continue to the May 21, 2010 CIP meeting, re-notify all departments to submit requests and include the ordinance in the email, and ask department heads to meet and bring forward a prioritized list. Olson stated that a discussion does need to be held so the committee has an opportunity to make the philosophical decision, which is most important. Chapman asked for a separated list of priorities from department heads in addition to other requests that do not meet requirements, such as software. Preston clarified that he included all requests, except those that were given in jest. Chapman also mentioned it would be good to have discussions about county-wide fire protection. Mayor Hanks suggested talking a look at definitions of categories and said maybe IT needs its own category. Preston said he is not in favor of continuing. He said he brought forward all requests, including software, as he did not feel he had the discretion of removing items from the list, so he preferred to go through the list to build the plan. Olson said the part of the discussion that is appropriate to take place here is the philosophical discussion, and she is open to further discussion on why certain requests would fit into the Government Buildings category. She said we need the philosophical discussion to understand it and rebuild the ordinance. Mayor Hanks suggested inviting the City Attorney to a meeting to explain his interpretation of the current ordinance and possibly have discussion among the committee to determine if the definition needs to be changed. Kooiker pointed out that IT items replace brick and mortar functions, which is something to think about as things move forward. Chapman suggested including the definition of government buildings in the email asking for funding requests, and it was suggested that the ordinance could be attached. Olson said she sees no need to prioritize the list. Motion carried with one NO from Preston.

Tech briefly described the issues with the **Sidewalks on the North Side of the 200 and 300 Blocks of St. Patrick Street** and said they will initiate a project to get them fixed. It was indicated that the city is paying for the sidewalks. Motion was made by Kooiker, second by Olson, to acknowledge the report and say thank you. It was indicated that the damage to the sidewalks was a result of a street project. Motion carried.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:44 A.M., and it was noted the next scheduled meeting is May 21, 2010 at 10:00 A.M. in the C/SAC, 3rd Floor West Conference Room.