

The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners met in regular session with the following members present: Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Reinhardt, Rettman and Chair Bennett – 7. Absent – 0. Also present were David Twa, County Manager, and Gary Davis, Assistant County Attorney.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

Commissioner Carter moved approval of the Agenda of the March 27, 2007 Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 7. Nays – 0.

MINUTES

Commissioner Reinhardt moved approval of the Minutes of the March 20, 2007 Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Carter. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 7. Nays – 0.

PROPERTY MANAGEMENT – Project Labor Agreement – City Hall/Courthouse Exterior Tuck Pointing and Window/Stone Sealant Replacement Project

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 7. Nays – 0. (2007-133)

WHEREAS, By Resolution 2002-351, the Ramsey County Board adopted a policy regarding the use of Project Labor Agreements (“PLA”), with the direction to staff to return in a workshop format at a future date to determine the final criteria for use of a Project Labor Agreement; and

WHEREAS, On April 26, 2005, the Ramsey County Board affirmed the policy regarding the use of Project Labor Agreements; and

WHEREAS, The policy requires a department to request input from parties likely to be interested in the project regarding use of a PLA; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Property Management department is planning a project for the Exterior Tuck Pointing and Window/Stone Sealant Replacement at the St. Paul City Hall/Ramsey County Courthouse; and

WHEREAS, The Property Management solicited recommendations in accordance with the policy; and

WHEREAS, The only response received was from the Saint Paul Building and Construction Trades Council; and

WHEREAS, The response recommended use of a Project Labor Agreement and stated as reasons: “Multiple trades working at site; contract negotiations; multi-craft; and security sensitive”; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, Based upon the only response received, Property Management concurs with the recommendation of the Saint Paul Building and Construction Trades Council and recommends the use of a Project Labor Agreement; and

WHEREAS, The County Board has taken all of the project factors and recommendations into account; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the use of a Project Labor Agreement for the City Hall/Courthouse Exterior Tuck Pointing and Window/Stone Sealant Replacement Project.

RAMSEY CONSERVATION DISTRICT – MN Board of Water and Soil Resources Local Water Management Planning Challenge Grant

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 7. Nays – 0. (2007-134)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board previously approved a *County Groundwater Quality Protection Plan*, which was subsequently approved by the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR); and

WHEREAS, BWSR allows soil and water conservation districts to apply on behalf of counties, if so delegated; and

WHEREAS, BWSR has \$350,000 available for this biennial grant, with a maximum amount per project of \$25,000 or \$75,000 if three or more local governmental units are involved; and

WHEREAS, Pending Ramsey County Board delegation, the Ramsey Conservation District Board of Supervisors, at its March 15th meeting, authorized seeking grant funding for five projects, ranging from \$2,500 to \$25,000, which would be matched by local funds; and

WHEREAS, Requests for similar delegations have previously been made by the Ramsey Conservation District and granted by the Board of Commissioners; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby delegates the Ramsey Conservation District as the authorized County agent to apply for and administer the FY-2008/2009 MN Board of Water and Soil Resources Local Water Management Planning Challenge Grant.

COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES – Detoxification Services – Information and Referral for Spanish Speaking Individuals

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 7. Nays – 0. (2007-135)

WHEREAS, Information and referral services are required to be provided by the State of Minnesota; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, This service must be provided during weekdays, weekends, and holidays as needed by Licensed Alcohol and Drug Counselors at the Ramsey County Detoxification Center; and

WHEREAS, The Community Human Services Department issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) on January 2, 2007, specifically to identify providers for Spanish speaking individuals; and

WHEREAS, The Department received one response from RIOS Programs, Inc; and

WHEREAS, The review panel determined that RIOS has the experience and demonstrated ability to provide this service; and

WHEREAS, Funding for this service is within the adopted budget for the Community Human Services Department; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the County Manager to approve the rate-setting agreement with RIOS Programs, Inc., 2233 North Hamline Avenue, Suite 510, Roseville, MN 55113, for information and referral services for Spanish speaking individuals at the Ramsey County Detoxification Center, at a rate of \$48 per hour for the period January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2011, and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Board authorizes the County Manager to execute the agreement.

MEDICAL EXAMINER – Reappointment of Dr. Michael B. McGee as Medical Examiner of Ramsey County

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

Commissioner Rettman said she believes the Medical Examiner position should either be that of a department head or within the civil service.

Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 6. Nays – Rettman - 1. (2007-136)

WHEREAS, Dr. Michael B. McGee is the appointed Medical Examiner of Ramsey County; and

WHEREAS, Dr. McGee has served faithfully and with distinction as Medical Examiner of Ramsey County since 1985; and

WHEREAS, A recent change in state law provides that the term of an appointed medical examiner may not be longer than four years. It is, therefore, necessary for the County Board to reappoint Dr. McGee as Ramsey County Medical Examiner; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners approves the appointment of Dr. Michael B. McGee as Medical Examiner of Ramsey County for a term of four years, commencing March 27, 2007.

COUNTY MANAGER/BUDGETING & ACCOUNTING – Monthly Report of Contracts and Final Payments and Grant submissions that were approved during the month of February 2007

(Continued)

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

Commissioner Parker said she recently heard about a contract that the Regional Railroad Authority (RRA) has, and asked if the Board ever approves those small RRA contracts and if the County Manager approves those contracts.

Commissioner Ortega said the small contracts do not initially go to the Board or the RRA for approval. Those contracts are within the limits established for the Director of the RRA.

Commissioner Parker believes they should all be on the list provided to the Board and that everything should go through the County Manager.

David Twa, County Manager, said small contracts for RRA, those for less than \$10,000, would not show up on the list being accepted today. If the Board wishes that to happen, there are two ways it could happen: 1) a separate list could be assembled for the RRA; or 2) if the Board prefers, they could all go through the County Manager's Office.

Commissioner Parker believes that everything the County does should go through the County Manager. Even though the RRA is a separate entity, as is the HRA, she believes the County Manager should have oversight of everything the County is involved with.

Chair Bennett will defer to the County Attorney, but believes it would be wise to have this first done at the RRA meetings and then come to the County Board.

Gary Davis, Assistant County Attorney, said he doesn't believe there would be any difficulty having a similar report as part of RRA or HRA but it would be better reflected within those particular organizations. He doesn't believe there would be any legal constraint against putting those contracts as part of this particular report but believes it would be more effective by having a separate report on the agenda of the particular organization's meeting.

Chair Bennett said that if the report was not first accepted by the RRA, it would be commingling the organizations.

Mr. Davis said the report should be approved by the RRA. He doesn't believe it would have to come to the County Board for approval, although it could – that would be a matter of policy.

Commissioner Carter said the large contracts come before the RRA, wherein the smaller contracts fall within the purview of the Director of RRA for approval. She believes what the Board is looking for is to have a complete set of records for contracts, whether they were approved at RRA or the County Board, or passed through because of the RRA Director's approval limit or the County Manager's approval limit. To have all those come before the Board at one time would be helpful.

Commissioner McDonough pointed out that it is acceptance of a report, not actually the official approval of a contract. His preference would be to see RRA and HRA do their own reports to help keep things separate so there is not a question of where the contracts fall. He believes it is important to have that full report.

Commissioner McDonough said it makes sense to have smaller contracts approved by the County Manager or the Director of RRA, but asked if there is a total dollar amount that can be approved by each of them.

Mr. Twa said there is not a limit, but it must be within the budget. He can't simply issue \$10,000 contracts unless the budget has been approved and those dollars are within the budget.

Chair Bennett asked if the conclusion is that a report would be done for acceptance by the RRA.

Commissioner Rettman said the contracts are very clearly identified and that the RRA contracts could be added at the bottom of the report. This report allows the Commissioners to know where the County is in the progress of what has been approved, and give the Commissioners an awareness of all the contracts approved. Having this report mitigates the surprise factor.

(Continued)

Commissioner Reinhardt believes it is a good idea to have a similar report for the RRA, but to remember they are separate entities. She believes the report should go to the appropriate body.

Chair Bennett asked Commissioner Parker if she would be comfortable with having reports go to the HRA, RRA and County Board to handle their own listings of contracts.

Commissioner Parker said she assumes that all the contracts go through the same process the County has established for doing RFPs, etc. and that the County Manager has oversight.

Mr. Twa said that is not correct as it relates to the RRA. It is correct for the HRA only because he is the interim Director of the HRA. He does not see anything that goes directly to the RRA.

Commissioner Parker sees the County Manager responsible for everything the County does.

Mr. Twa said this is a policy decision by the Board. There is an interesting relationship between the County Manager's Office and Regional Railroad Authority in the sense that he does the performance review of the Director of RRA. Historically, much of the details have been separated and the Board has treated it separately.

Commissioner Parker asked about the Ramsey County Library system.

Mr. Twa said the Library has a separate board that is not the County Board. In that case, he is typically asked to give input into the performance review of the Library Director, but the Library Board actually does the review.

Chair Bennett asked for a vote on acceptance of the report.

Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker, Bennett – 7.
Nays – 0. (2007-137)

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 February 2007.

Continuing discussion of the above issue, Commissioner McDonough suggested that the County Manager come back to the Board or the RRA with thoughts on what the process or policy would be where the County Manager would at least see and review all the contracts that are let by the RRA or the HRA. There is the thought that everything does go through the County Manager's Office, but it really does not.

Commissioner Parker believes it makes sense to ask the County Manager to come to the RRA with information. She believes the same would be true for the Library. Sometimes they feel they are outside the system.

Mr. Davis said the Library Board has a certain amount of semi-independent authority under the Statute. The basic operation, administration and management of the Library Board are within the Library Board itself - separate and apart from the County Board. There is a relationship of

(Continued)

financial matters between the Library Board and the County because all their financial business goes through the County's Budgeting & Accounting department, but there is a separate authority for the Library Board and the operation of that Board by the citizen group, separate and apart from the County.

Chair Bennett clarified that the County Manager would provide the Board with a report on how this should be handled.

Commissioner Ortega said that approval and acceptance are two separate functions. Looking at the Corrections Department, there is completely different relationship there, too. There are several different relationships. Perhaps the County Manager should look at all the entities and find the common factor in terms of the reporting function. The County Board should be able to have the reporting function so everything can be tracked. Anything above \$10,000 must come to the County Board or RRA.

Commissioner Parker said Commissioner Ortega raised a good point about the Corrections Department. She would want there to be oversight by someone.

Commissioner Ortega the Corrections' items come to the County Board, and the RRA items are approved by the RRA Board. The point is that approval is one thing and should be separated from the reporting.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that makes sense; this is a report that should be received by the Board. It is a matter of doing a similar report for RRA and having it come to the RRA Board.

Commissioner Carter agreed that it is about separating the reporting function from the approval function. As the Board does not see everything, the consideration for the County Manager would be to ensure the Board sees all of the contracts that have either been approved by department heads, the County Manager, etc. in one form or another.

Commissioner McDonough said there are several management and operation structures. They are all being reported except for RRA. All the Board is looking for is to get a report for the contracts that are issued in RRA, and in his opinion, should go to RRA. Every other management structure is already being reported to the County Board.

Commissioner Rettman said Budgeting and Accounting knows how to do these reports. Right now, there is no reporting mechanism for RRA contracts.

Commissioner Reinhardt clarified that everything within the County's purview is on this report. What the Board needs is the same mechanism for RRA. They can provide that information and have it on the agenda for RRA.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Terry Speiker, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, said there has been a lot of activity in the area of transit and transportation proposals. There was a meeting of metro county commissioners to talk about issues relating to transportation. The House and Senate bills are not too different from one another, although there are significant differences in them. She provided a handout describing the two bills and said this bill goes to the heart of a major part of the Board's legislative package. The Board has supported the AMC comprehensive transit and transportation funding proposal, and has been working with the Metro Transitways Development Board (MTDB) around how their funding package, funding proposal and governance proposal, fit with the AMC. There is a section in both of the bills that focuses on funding and governance within the metro area.

Commissioner McDonough said he attended a meeting of the Executive Board of the MTDB for discussion of the two bills. He also attended a meeting of commissioners from metro area counties. Most of the conversation at both meetings came down to the governance issue.

(Continued)

Regarding the geographic area for the Joint Powers Board, the position of the MTDB was three contiguous counties. Neither version of the bill includes that area; the five-county area is much more in line with that, with their ability to add counties. The Senate version must have seven counties, whether or not Scott or Dakota counties are ready to come in.

Commissioner McDonough highlighted other differences in the bills including: who would levy the tax; it would not be by referendum in the metro area; outstate, these boards could be established, but it would have to be done by referendum; the House is county only, the Senate version includes cities or towns; the House recognizes there needs to be weighted voting, MTDB Board has taken the position that there needs to be weighted voting, the Senate is very prescriptive in weighted voting; how to pay the administrative expenses; and sales tax proceeds.

Commissioner McDonough said feedback on why the Senate is being so prescriptive on the Joint Powers Board (JPB) membership and the weighted voting, was that originally, this was set up to go into effect July 1, 2007. A great deal of money will come into play immediately; they were not sure the JPB could get this worked out and they did not want to lose the opportunity to start collecting money right away. The MTDB clearly indicated the response that it will be done in whatever time is available. Apparently, the effective date has been changed to September 1st, which gives more time to sort out everything.

Commissioner Rettman referred to the use of the sales tax proceeds, and said that both versions include capital and operating costs and operating assistance for transit, and asked if the levy could be rolled back.

Commissioner McDonough said there was a great deal of discussion about operations. He doesn't believe there are enough safeguards so that it won't be used to backfill operating deficits in the current system that the State and Metro Council have responsibility to run. There needs to be many more conversations about operating costs. He believes there is general agreement among the MTDB Executive Board around the recognition that as lines are brought on, operating costs are going to increase. They have always taken the position that these dollars should be for capital and for improving the system and not for operating the system. He believes the legislation identifies the date of January 1, 2009 where Hiawatha's local share would come off the local property tax and would be able to be paid for through this.

Commissioner Rettman asked if there would be a corresponding reduction for Central Corridor.

Commissioner McDonough said it would never go on because that line won't operate before then.

Nick Riley, Intergovernmental Relations, said the county would not have any operations costs. It would supercede anything before it.

Commissioner Rettman said that levy could then be eliminated by 2009.

Mr. Riley responded affirmatively.

Commissioner McDonough said it is important to make certain the language clearly identifies how these dollars could be used for operations in the future. All the counties agree that language is needed. The danger is that the dollars start getting eaten up either in backfilling current operations or instead of replacing the 50% contribution that Hennepin County has for Hiawatha and the expected contribution of local dollars for Central Corridor all of a sudden becomes 100%. We can't allow that to happen because fairly quickly all the new dollars for capital improvements in corridors would get eaten up in operating costs.

Ms. Speiker said in the House bill there is already a provision to start funneling some of this money, in anticipation of it appearing, to assist with the operating deficits for Met Council right now.

(Continued)

When the MTDB talked about it, they talked about their concern about this being an easy fund to raid.

Commissioner Reinhardt referred to the weighted voting, and said it was prescriptive in the Senate bill because they were not convinced it could be done in time. Now that the date has been moved, and the fact that it can be done has been expressed, she asked if the author is willing to remove that language. The percentages are troublesome; if Hennepin got either Dakota or Ramsey County to go along with it, they would rule. Since the MTDB has expressed the fact that it will be done in accordance with basically how the House version reads, is there any willingness to remove that language?

Ms. Speiker said it is not just weighted voting that is a piece of this proposal; it is weighted voting, how the funds are to be administered and what is done in terms of many lines to be studied. It is a package of things. The Legislator who put that together is Senator Dibble, the Chair of the subcommittee that has been overseeing the entire discussion about transit. Part of what the MTDB decided on Friday, was that they do want to meet with him and talk specifically about this issue. He is interested in trying to keep a package of things together that meets the desires of transit advocates.

Mr. Riley said this could be changed in conference committee, but this is how it passed off the floor in the Senate. The House is a little behind. Regarding weighted membership, it is assumed there are 14 members; one-half from cities in the metro area, so each figure would be split in half – the cities would carry half – so Ramsey County would only have about 8% of a weighted vote. He believes this accounts for 60% of the vote; each member would get 2.5% vote to begin with then this percentage would be on top of that.

Chair Bennett said the argument yesterday was that the counties were the ones who put the money in, not the cities.

Commissioner Reinhardt referred to the specific eight corridors and asked if they are listed in the bill.

Mr. Riley responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that it doesn't make any sense to her to include specific corridors.

Ms. Speiker said there was a great deal of conversation about that. The language is unclear if state law would have to be changed to add or subtract corridors, etc. The whole section is very prescriptive, which is why the MTDB Executive Board decided the smartest thing to do was to meet with Senator Dibble and talk it through.

The important thing is to get the two bills into conference committee and to have these kinds of discussion, rather than have the bills go down because there are many concerns about various parts of the bills. The Legislature is talking about taking this out and having discussions about it during their Easter break, so they can get the feel of the citizens.

Chair Bennett said there was agreement that there would not be a push to get it to the Governor's desk, but it needs to be negotiated. Over the Easter break, outstate legislators go home and it has been tradition that they hear the hot issues from the street corners and coffee shops. They are hoping people will say there needs to be something done about roads. The State needs \$1.2 billion over the next 5-7 years on roads and transit; the Legislature wants to hear from the citizens about what it wants in order to be best served.

Commissioner Reinhardt supports doing what needs to be done to put protections in place to use the funds for their original intent – transit and transportation.

Commissioner Ortega asked how much money either one of these bills would raise.

(Continued)

Ms. Speiker said the Senate bill raises about \$1.2 or 1.3 billion annually. The House bill would raise about \$1 billion annually. The difference is how the gas tax piece would work; one is indexed and the other is not indexed.

Commissioner McDonough said there is a difference in the wheelage tax. In the Senate you need to do \$20; in the House you could do \$10 or \$15. The State's administration has been fighting to have that flexibility.

Commissioner Ortega asked if there is a limit on the number of counties that could come in.

Ms. Speiker said there is no limit.

Commissioner Parker asked if there could be a string of counties all the way to Duluth. The response was affirmative, as long as they are contiguous.

Mr. Riley said it is important that the MTDB or the JPB form the rules because if it is in law, your hands are tied. Every time another county would join, the vote would diminish by that much more. If it is a line going out, there could be another subcommittee to handle that particular line rather than them being a full-fledged member.

Commissioner Ortega said the focus must be on the bill. He is supportive of the pieces but is worried about the outcome. This tries to address the big problem of governance and revenue, which is a good step forward. The problem he sees is that this money will go to the operations of Hiawatha and Central corridors. This doesn't change the current governance, but imposes another piece on top of a system that he believes is broken. He isn't arguing against this legislation, but it will be critical that the language is fair and balanced for the East Metro Area. Fifty percent would go to the Met Council and the other 50% to capital. It imposes another governance structure and as this expands, you get into trouble because the base is in the seven counties economically. There are no big contributors between here and Duluth. The weighting of the vote is a minor discussion; he is more interested in the outcome and where the money will end up.

Ms. Speiker said that in the House section of the bill that came out yesterday for taxes, there is a prohibition against any optional city or local unit of government sales tax in the future. The chair of the subcommittee said it would be a hot topic of conversation once the two bills are into conference committee. The other conversation going on is whether it would be wiser for the legislature to think about broadening the base of the sales tax and being able to lower the amount of the sales tax. Part of what is going on with sales tax is that as you build these things, and add to it the 3/8 cent that is going forward for the arts, natural environment, and water, and stadiums or infrastructure in general, about how to best use a tax resource. She doesn't know how that will play out in relation to this bill.

Chair Bennett said the discussion yesterday was about the \$1.2 billion, not focusing on where the money is coming from. You need to buy roads and transit – they cost money, and the amount of money needed is \$1.2 billion.

Commissioner Ortega agrees but he doesn't know if this bill would get to that point.

Commissioner McDonough believes the weighted governance is the number one thing. There are two approaches: 1) to make sure a weighted governance structure that is fair and equal and let the lines work themselves out; or 2) go through legislation to make sure the dollars are spent a certain way. If we take that approach, it opens the door for every other single group that wants to be prescriptive. The position taken was to give us the opportunity to be as flexible as possible and to come up with a governance structure and voting structure to manage these dollars in a good manner.

Commissioner Ortega said he was misunderstood and if it is going to be one bill or another, it will all come out reasonable and will follow the patterns of other things in the past. It will be Hennepin and Ramsey with the majority of the weight. His concern is that the dollars that come out

(Continued)

of this will be pretty much expended. He wants to make sure there is a balance in the lines. He believes there will be a certain amount of money to plan with, but most of it will go to the operations of Hiawatha and Central corridors. In the long run, there will have to be some way of being much broader. There is the issue of the stadium taxes and other pieces. He would like them all kept in perspective as the process moves forward. The bigger issue is the sales tax and how every other county would look at it.

Commissioner Parker agrees with trying to push this toward more flexibility, but would go further than what is listed. Rather than having one joint powers board that would do everything, perhaps we should think about the possibility of having a separate joint powers board, which has taxing authority, for each corridor. Then, you could either buy into it or not. The taxing would only be relevant to that particular corridor.

Mr. Riley said that on the House side, the leased vehicle tax would be used for property tax relief, which totals \$65 million annually. Going back to the discussion of governance, if it can be kept as open as possible to allow the counties to work it out, it is better than having the legislators do it. The counties know how well they work together.

Commissioner McDonough said it likely would be some type of combined bill that comes out. The key message that came out of yesterday's meeting is that everyone agrees that there is a \$1.3 billion problem. We are not here to advocate for a gas tax or a sales tax, but the problem needs to be solved.

Chair Bennett said that could include property taxes, but no one believes property taxes are the way to go.

Commissioner McDonough said Commissioner McLaughlin has been making presentations to the business community in Minneapolis to help generate some support for this. One slide showed that the percentage of property taxes used for transit and transportation has grown significantly over the years. No one believes property taxes are the right way to pay for this.

Ms. Speiker said there are a lot of other things happening at the legislature. The legislative tracking sheet had been updated and distributed electronically to the Commissioners on Friday.

Mr. Riley said on the House side, various corridors have received funding in the Capital Investment Bill. There is \$500,000 now for Rush Line, \$500,000 for Red Rock, \$500,000 for the I-94 Corridor, \$2 million for high-speed rail, \$3 million for the Union Depot, and \$30 million for Central Corridor. On the Senate side, Senator Langseth took the I-94 Corridor, the Rush Line, Red Rock and a couple corridors in the west metro, and gave them \$250,000 to do a corridor study. He put in \$2 million for high-speed rail, \$4 million for the Union Depot, and \$40 million for Central Corridor. Combining the two bills, Ramsey County is in very good shape. Ramsey County had requested \$40 million for Central Corridor, and by all indications, we may receive that. With \$3 million on one side and \$4 million on the other side for the Union Depot, it looks extremely good. It is not what we requested, but it keeps us going. High-speed rail – Red Rock – will get built in the future, is at \$2 million on both sides.

Chair Bennett said he understands that the House removed language regarding the lower level at the Depot.

Mr. Riley said there is language now just citing the Depot, but some of the lines cite the lower level. The argument is catching on better now that the light rail needs a place to park its cars. Otherwise, this will deadhead in St. Paul and have to go back to Minneapolis on the last run, and first thing in the morning, send a train over to start out our line. The storage there is going to be tremendous for extra cars.

Commissioner Ortega said that is an important point, because the Commissioners will hear the Met Council argue that it will cost more dollars to go to the Concourse Level. What they don't

(Continued)

say is: 1) that it is going to cost that much more when they would have to expand on a facility, which would be in Minneapolis; and 2) they have trains that at the beginning and at the end of operations have to go back to Minneapolis, and then back to St. Paul to start service – they would need some extra operational expense, versus having a facility right at the Depot where the cars could be stored and cut down on operation costs. It depends on how you would look at the budget to make things work. When he is asked if it would add any more money to go to the Concourse, he replies “absolutely not”, because if you don’t spend it here, it depends on where you put it. The Met Council might say it is an added expense – it really isn’t. It just means instead of putting it in Minneapolis, you put it at the Union Depot.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that after reading Chairman Bell’s comment recently, he was talking about \$2-3 million and how it was a good thing they had that taken out of the bill. It is just going to go someplace else – probably more because they don’t have the Depot setup in Minneapolis yet. As Commissioner Ortega said, the need to go back and forth between St. Paul and Minneapolis every day increases operational costs – the money would be gone quickly. It just makes no sense. Chairman Bell talked about how pleased he was that the \$2-3 million was removed, but it was taken out only on one side. She asked if the Concourse is still stated in the Senate side?

Mr. Riley said it only says the Depot on the Senate side right now.

Commissioner Reinhardt asked if the House says the Depot Concourse?

Mr. Riley responded no. Neither side says the Concourse, just the Depot, which is further than the Met Council wanted it stated.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the Met Council made it clear they wanted to take it out.

Chair Bennett said history shows that the Depot was always used to service vehicles that came and went.

Mr. Riley said language was put in on the Senate side stating that District Heating can go for federal dollars to replace the costs of moving the lines where disruption will occur when the line goes down Cedar Street. They allow for federal dollars to come in, to replace that without it counting against the overall cost of Central Corridor.

Commissioner Ortega said that is what the State Legislature says; that is not what FTA says. He cautioned that this could really come up as a cost against the line. That means whether we are talking about extra stations or coming to the Concourse, it could make it more difficult. We would have to work with FTA to make sure they don’t count that; we don’t know that for certain.

Mr. Riley said that was put in by the lobbyist for the District Heating.

Commissioner Ortega said he supports what they are doing; it is going to impact the taxpayers of St. Paul and the County, but he wanted to make it clear that this is not neutral – there would be an impact.

Commissioner McDonough said it important to identify the things pointed out by Commissioner Ortega about storage of trains in St. Paul saving operational costs in the future. There may be some up-front capital costs, but there would be long-term benefits on operations of the system. We can’t lose sight of the fact that if we don’t invest the dollars to have a fully operational and seamless inter-modal transportation system, it won’t be successful; people won’t use it. It costs money to do something right, to do it for the long-term, so that it will be successful.

Mr. Riley said there is also \$2 million for the pre-design for the Rice Creek Bridge, which is in both the House and Senate. This is for a support item listed on page 15 – the Rice Street and Highway 36 design money. The money would go to the Department of Trade and Economic Development, in the same way as the Medtronics’ funding. There is funding in the bill in a different section for the University of Minnesota for biotech buildings at \$30 million on the Senate side. He

(Continued)

did not know what it was on the House side. This appears in the Bonding Bill on both House and Senate side.

Mr. Riley said University of Minnesota President Bruininks testified yesterday on the Senate bill regarding the importance of those buildings for the University and the Mayo Clinic, now that they have a partnership. They will be vital for the future in the growth of that industry. They do not want to do this in a regular bonding year. Every other year, they will be coming in for these biotech buildings so they don't compete with other University requests.

Ms. Speiker said a lot of Ramsey County's policy statements talks about trying to replace federal funding, which is a piece staff have been working on. Commissioner Reinhardt testified twice in the last week on a number of things that have been lost, or will be lost because of the Federal Reconciliation Act. There was a House hearing yesterday. This involves child protection, public health, chemical dependency, case management, child support, etc. Originally, it was part of the request that the Association of Minnesota Counties (AMC) was putting forward for \$55 million ongoing funding. They are at about \$50 million for one-time money.

Commissioner Reinhardt said there have been different discussions, but as far at the total, it probably is about \$50 million – about \$40 million for the targeted case management portion, \$8 million for child support, and \$2 million for case management, as well as some other parts. A portion of it was one-time money.

Ms. Speiker said this is getting good reception in both House and Senate hearings. There was \$40 million in the Governor's budget, too, so this looks well positioned.

Commissioner Rettman asked about the outcome for Rock-Tenn. She also asked for an update on Workforce Solutions.

Ms. Speiker said there has been an interesting discussion, with Commissioner McDonough being very engaged about what goes on with the Youth Work programs. They have not yet seen the House omnibus bill.

Commissioner Rettman said an update in an email would work.

Commissioner McDonough said he could provide a short update. Ramsey County had asked for \$50,000 for the Summer Youth Program, partially based on the fact that Minneapolis was successful last year in getting a carve-out, and St. Paul had come forward for a carve-out. St. Paul was supporting Ramsey County's program but had its own request for \$500,000, as well. Following conversations, they moved their request to the general fund dollars. They still have their request out there, but it is for general fund dollars. Ramsey County's request is still moving through to come out of Workforce dollars. The bigger piece Ramsey County has been working on is that these carve-outs tend to come back because there is a great working relationship with the fifteen Workforce Service Areas in the State. All of a sudden there are carve-outs pitting each against the other, and that is not a good way to do business. The Minnesota Youth Program Fund has continued to be chipped away, and the Governor would put no money in. The best long-term goal being worked on is to try to increase the dollars for the Minnesota Youth Program Fund. There is already an agreed upon formula about disbursement to the Workforce Service areas. The response has been good and the recognition from the Legislature is that these carve-outs are not good.

Commissioner Rettman asked if the one in the general fund request is progressing, or if they are both progressing.

Ms. Speiker said there are three things – the increased money for the Minnesota Youth Program, St. Paul's request, and Ramsey County's request. There is also the *Building Lives* request. All of these ideas have had hearings. Staff has seen what is on the Senate side. The tracking materials will be updated for a sense of the House and Senate sides. Everything is still alive, and is expected to be in the Conference Committee. Staff has a meeting scheduled this afternoon with the two St. Paul lobbyists to go through the joint legislative package.

(Continued)

Commissioner Rettman asked if staff are considering bills such as the low-income at-risk youth cited on page 5.

Ms. Speiker said that is Ramsey County's.

Commissioner Rettman referred to *Building Lives* on page 8, and asked if the item increasing the dollars is not listed.

Ms. Speiker responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Reinhardt pointed out that Ramsey County is not the only one providing testimony. Yesterday, she heard about a program in the St. Cloud area, and others coming forward. It is a good thing for the overall need for the fund, and it is a proven program.

Mr. Riley said Commissioner McDonough is correct – we are trying to build that bigger fund – it is the right way to go. Right now, in the Senate, about \$10 million is needed in the bigger fund to get up to the \$750,000 request for Ramsey County. Right now, the Senate is at \$5 million in the bigger fund. The House Chair has said he wants to put in \$10 million. Staff will know more today. The understanding is that the House Chair would be putting in some money for *Building Lives*. Ramsey County didn't get a hearing on the Senate side for that bill, so it will go to Conference Committee. It may not be a large amount, possibly \$100,000 for that program. The St. Paul program is in for \$500,000 on the Senate side coming out of the general fund, so it is a stand-alone program.

Mr. Riley said on the House side, Chairman Hilty has \$4 million in his bill for Rock-Tenn for one year. There is nothing on the Senate side at this time, and he did not know how that would be reconciled. There are a couple good lobbyists working on that, and they will probably come out with something.

Commissioner Rettman said Senator Anderson has a lot of knowledge on this, but it didn't get a hearing in the Senate.

Mr. Riley said her bill is coming out today as well, but she has the Environment/Finance Bill. They are looking at a number of issues.

Commissioner Reinhardt said she has been to the hearing on the issue of Rock-Tenn. Ramsey County was recognized as being in support of the legislation. There will be a hearing this afternoon that she would be testifying at regarding SCORE funds, as well as bringing in the issue of Rock-Tenn. The \$4 million is significant. Representative Hilty worked with the folks from Rock-Tenn and the Port Authority to make something move forward that he thought made more sense than the original \$20 million request. Basically, it is to say this is something viable and can move forward – that is what the \$4 million is for. One issue that has come up on this is whether there is a strong commitment from the parent company for Rock-Tenn to stay if they get these funds. It was made clear that once they have the numbers the intent is to be here for a very long period of time. They need to get the preliminary engineering done to know that this is going to work, and that commitment will absolutely follow, but the commitment can't be made until you get those numbers.

Commissioner Ortega asked if there is opposition.

Ms. Speiker said there is no one else.

Commissioner Reinhardt said it is about the money and the long-term commitment that they will stay.

Ms. Speiker said the hearings have had very good discussions. There is a real recognition that Rock-Tenn provides this very unique resource to the State of Minnesota, and nationally. The Legislature is very tuned into that.

Commissioner Ortega said he has heard some folks' concerns about burning garbage and things like that. He wondered if that came into the discussions.

Commissioner Reinhardt said not in these particular hearings. That is an issue that Rock-Tenn, the Port Authority, and others are working on with the Green Institute and other interested parties.

Mr. Riley said for the Corrections Facility, Ramsey County's technical bill passed off the floor and is in the Omnibus Bill on the House side. For short-term offenders, the Governor is suggesting \$30 a day from the current \$9 or \$11. The Senate is at \$33, and the House will be at about \$30. The House Chair asked if there is any way we can move any Ramsey County money around to pay for some of the other needs in corrections with that extra money. Staff had responded that is an internal discussion for the Board to make at the time we see the money.

In the Tax Committee, there will be \$15 million in County program aid on the House side; \$60 million on the Senate side. A lot of that is predicated on the different taxes they are going to raise; i.e. the upper tier income tax.

Commissioner Rettman asked if that was \$60 million.

Mr. Riley responded affirmatively. There is quite a disparity. The City's LGA is a big disparity.

Commissioner Rettman asked if that is new money.

Mr. Riley responded affirmatively. The City has an automatic 2.5% increase each year in the provision in the House. Right now, Ramsey County gets a 1% increase per year in the House bill.

Commissioner Reinhardt referred to a couple of typographical errors on page 8. One is the Children's Safety Act listed as \$40,000 in the Governor's budget when it should be \$40 million. She asked if the amount is correct at \$125-\$250 million for Facing Alcohol's Costs to Society; is that the \$.10 per drink?

Mr. Riley said it is not being considered.

Ms. Speiker said that is gone away because the smoking ban and this one can't be done in the same year. The House Chair had said that is too much money and is not likely to happen this year.

OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Reinhardt reported:

- On the well-attended Grand Opening for the new Maplewood Library on Saturday.

Commissioner Parker said there was an estimate of 4,000 attendees at the Grand Opening.

Commissioner Ortega said one of his Highland Park constituents phoned him to say how impressed she was with this new library.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the community, the environment, technology improvements, partnering with 3M and McGough Construction, the Friends of the Library, Heart of the Beasts puppets, the artwork, efficient use of funds, all made this a great benefit to the community. Cravings Café, a locally owned company, is located in this library.

Chair Bennett reported that the Library Board approved remodeling for the expansion of the Roseville Library.

ADJOURNMENT

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