

City Council Work Session

September 15, 2008
5:30 PM
Community Center

ATTENDANCE:

Mayor/Council (please check) X Tussing, X Ronquillo, X Gaghen, X Stevens, X Pitman, X Veis, X Ruegamer, X Ulledalen, X McCall, X Astle, X Clark.

ADJOURN TIME:

Agenda

TOPIC #1	<i>Public Comment</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

- **Joe White, Billings** said the bridge between Lockwood and Billings and the Montana Street bridges seemed unstable and similar to the Minneapolis bridge that collapsed.

TOPIC #2	<i>Emergency Medical Advisory Board Annual Report</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Skip Godfrey advised he just assumed the Chair of the EMS Commission and Charlie Hamwey was the Vice-Chair. Mr. Godfrey recognized Kathy Gibson and Val Ronquillo from the Billings Fire Department for their assistance with the evening's presentation, along with Chief Bill Rash from Lockwood Fire Department who was instrumental in developing a good working relationship with Lockwood.

Mr. Godfrey noted that alcohol-related issues were a continuing problem, but the Community Crisis Center assisted in that area along with substance abuse cases, post-traumatic stress syndrome and similar issues that the hospital emergency rooms were not equipped to handle. He introduced Marcy Neary from the Community Crisis Center who was available to answer any questions about it.

Mr. Godfrey said the Emergency Medical Board's goal was to continue the development of a paramedic service to the Billings Fire Department. He noted that fairly often, the fire engine was the first to arrive on the scene of a 911 call. He said the procedure had changed somewhat in that fire units were dispatched to every call, and lights and/or sirens were used as needed depending on the type of call. Anne Kindness from the Dispatch Center confirmed that engines were dispatched to every call, but traveled with the flow of traffic without lights and sirens. Mr. Godfrey said another significant goal was to develop the paramedic and

EMS service in general. He noted that those programs implied additional costs because as firefighters upgraded their skills, their pay was upgraded.

Mr. Godfrey reviewed the EMS Commission membership. He noted that the local operations manager for AMR, Jim Weber attended each meeting and provided reports at the meetings. Mr. Godfrey advised that compliance to established standards had been quite good.

Mr. Godfrey reviewed notable activities as follows: Dr. Dan Lewis was selected as the medical director for AMR; the Community Crisis Center opened; four firefighters were on scholarship to complete paramedic certification; the Fire Department operated the safety net ambulance but then returned it to AMR due to labor issues; Fire Station #1 opened; emergency dispatching was coordinated and combined through the City and AMR; a supplemental budget request for additional equipment and training for paramedics was denied. He noted that there were 19 paramedics at the present time, but 28-30 were needed to cover all the shifts.

Mr. Godfrey reviewed other notable activities of AMR as follows: CPAP, a practice that used positive airway devices as opposed to intubation; Home for the Holidays, a free service that transported up to eight patients from skilled nursing facilities to individual residences to allow patients to spend Christmas and Thanksgiving Day with friends/family; Sentimental Journey, which provided transportation for individuals and family members during their last days; Family Services used AMR's site for their back-to-school and holiday gift distribution center; and Safe Kids in Yellowstone County which promoted seat belt and bicycle helmet use in conjunction with police, fire and hospital personnel.

Councilmember Gaghen asked if the bicycle helmets were available through agencies or to any child in need. Mr. Godfrey said he was unsure exactly how the program worked other than AMR provided funds to that organization and it was primarily for car seats.

Mr. Godfrey outlined goals. He said he understood the difficulty with the safety net ambulance and hoped something could be worked out because it could make a significant difference. He said Chief Rash volunteered to work with the people in Laurel to see if a similar working relationship could be established there. He said there was a difference because Billings had full-time professional firefighters and Laurel's department was staffed with volunteers. He noted that growth had brought the cities closer together.

Mr. Godfrey advised there was a second ambulance service operating in Billings. He said Eagle Ambulance operated inside the City without licensing because it was based outside the city limits. He noted that problems existed if that ambulance service operated without bonding and was not authorized to make code calls with red lights and sirens because when transporting elderly or immobile people, that could change rapidly. He said another problem was that a full-service ambulance company such as AMR took 911 calls and fees for many of them were not paid, but were offset with pre-arranged transports reimbursed by insurance companies. Mr. Godfrey stated that the other ambulance service was taking only the pre-paid transports. Mr. Godfrey stated that that company should have to be bonded and operate on the same basis or should not operate within the City. Mr. Godfrey suggested a review of the ordinance related to that practice.

Councilmember Gaghen asked where Eagle Ambulance was based. Mr. Godfrey responded that he saw two ambulances parked across I-90, about 1-1.5 miles east of South Billings Boulevard.

Councilmember Ulledalen explained that when tiered response was implemented in 2001-2002, he thought it meant there was a broader spectrum for the dispatchers to decide if a fire truck went to a call. Ms. Kindness responded that she and Fire Chief Dextras would examine amending aid for better utilization. Councilmember Ulledalen said he had received comments from people that a fire crew and truck were sent all the time even when an ambulance only was requested. Councilmember Pitman commented that it was even to the point that a person died and the fire truck was still sent. Fire Chief Dextras explained that there was a huge liability associated with EMS care when people without medical backgrounds believed someone was dead when it was possible they were not, so it was best to err on the side of responding and determining how long the patient had been expired or if medical attention was needed. He provided another example when a person thought they had an emergency and called 911, then decided it was not an emergency and called back to cancel the request. Chief Dextras said if no response was made to those calls after having that initial information, it resulted in a liability for the City. He noted that the fire crews had nothing better to do than meet the emergency needs of the community.

Councilmember Gaghen asked how situations were handled when a patient stipulated no extraordinary care yet other family members called for assistance. Chief Dextras responded that the emergency crews still had to go with the liability reason unless there was a “do not resuscitate” order at the scene. He said the jurisdiction that had authority to respond to alarms could be held liable for not providing a service.

Councilmember Ulledalen referred to a 1994 ordinance that was probably put together quickly and re-tooling could be required to bring it current. He noted there was a funding issue from the City’s perspective in regard to getting into the paramedic business. He noted that discussion occurred regarding staffing in specific areas or at every station. Chief Dextras added there were many different models used by communities based on varying factors.

Councilmember McCall asked about security at the Community Crisis Center. Ms. Neary responded that security was provided by a local security company and in place 24/7. She added that deputies from both the Sheriff Department and Police Department made occasional visits as they brought potential clients. Ms. Neary said she did not know the exact dollar figure, but knew the security was a costly endeavor. Councilmember Gaghen commented that security was a concern of the neighborhood.

Mr. Godfrey advised that Councilmember Clark participated in the selection of the new fire chief and asked him to repeat what was said about the nationwide EMS trend. Councilmember Clark said the nationwide trend was about the same as Billings of almost 90% of the calls being medical alarms. Chief Dextras clarified it was about 74% medical and fires represented 5-6% of the calls.

Councilmember Stevens asked if it was also a trend to have different vehicles to respond to EMS calls versus using a fire engine. Chief Dextras said it was his experience that departments transitioned to quick-response vehicles as discussed at the previous Council meeting. He noted that concept had been in the fire service industry for about 30 years and he supported it as well.

TOPIC #3	<i>Inner Belt Loop</i>
----------	-------------------------------

PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Public Works Director Dave Mumford advised that a Council Initiative directed Public Works staff to pursue the possibility of an inner belt loop to connect Billings Heights to Zimmerman Trail. He advised that a planning study was contracted in 2005 to review alignments, and meetings were held with developers and engineering groups to determine where a belt loop should be located. Mr. Mumford said his proposal was to complete the project within the next three years. He explained that Alkali Creek Road could be utilized with minor adjustments for a 55 mph road. He said the proposal was to curve at the Burlington Northern fuel tanks, and to travel over private property and Department of Natural Resources School Trust Fund land. He said the idea was to complete the project in two phases with the first phase using the 66 foot right-of-way that currently existed, then purchasing the full 100 foot right-of-way for future development. He said that would include a 10 foot trail, 6 foot shoulders, two lanes, and 10 feet of drainage. Councilmember Veis asked if that was currently a county road. Mr. Mumford advised that the County Commissioners would be asked for that road so they would not have to maintain it.

Mr. Mumford explained that a secondary concept was to let Wicks join it in the future as development warranted which would require developers to pay for that connection. He said the road would be built so that current infrastructure would remain in place as development required expansion of the road, and that any development could occur along that road without causing water and sewer problems.

Councilmember Veis asked if a large mixed development proposal would be denied until other development occurred. Mr. Mumford explained that the Planning Department would work on a master plan to add to the development. He noted that Council could approve projects like that, but with the limited funding, that would halt rehab projects. Mr. Mumford pointed out that most of the land was owned by one family so discussion could be held about where the development made the most sense.

Councilmember McCall asked where the road was in relation to the existing Rehberg Ranch. Mr. Mumford pointed out that it was to the north and west of that subdivision. He said that development was designed with the inner belt loop in mind. Councilmember Veis asked about a water line to Zimmerman Trail. Mr. Mumford explained that water was in developed areas near it and about one-half mile away. He noted that the inner belt loop would significantly reduce travel time from the current 9.5 miles to 6.5 miles from Senators Boulevard to Zimmerman Trail.

Councilmember Ruegamer asked if there was something in writing that showed that Rehberg Ranch knew that the inner belt loop would be constructed. Planning Director Candi Beaudry said it was not a platted right-of-way, but there was a master plan that identified it through a planned development agreement, but there was nothing platted on the ground. Mr. Mumford said the property would have to be purchased from the Rehbergs. Councilmember Ulledalen asked how much was owned by the Rehbergs and the State. Mr. Mumford said a very small portion was owned by Rehbergs.

Mr. Mumford advised there was money in the CIP to begin study and work on the project. He said he wanted to move forward because he could not purchase right-of-way until the route was certain. He proposed funding the project with a revenue bond that would utilize arterial fees to make the payment. He said state statute would need to be changed to

add the word “roadway” in it. He said Mae Nan Ellington advised that she had already been requested by the League of Cities to include that word in the statute. He added that several legislators were willing to carry that change forward and would check into what kind of situation the City could get with DNR on their property.

Mr. Mumford said he hoped to hire a consultant by late fall for the design study, so the study could be presented to Council for approval. He said arterial fee funds were available for the cost of the design study. Councilmember Ronquillo asked if using those arterial fees would take away from other projects. Mr. Mumford said the \$300,000 estimated for the study represented about one-third of the arterial fees and there would be sufficient funds left for other projects. He advised that changes to the CIP would be presented to Council in October. He noted it was estimated to be a \$12 million project.

Mr. Mumford explained that another alternative would be to go the federal option which would mean a longer timeline and would be more expensive. He said the proposed timeline was considered reasonable and could be accomplished. Councilmember Veis asked if the project would be phased as funds were available if the statute was not changed. Mr. Mumford responded that it would take longer, but could be done that way if necessary.

Councilmember Pitman said it was critical to the Heights. He mentioned an accident on Main Street a couple of weeks earlier that backed up traffic all the way to Wicks Lane and every possible arterial was backed up with no place for cars to go. He said the belt loop was a good option without impact to a lot of people. Mr. Mumford said even with a Bench connector, accidents in that area would not alleviate traffic problems. He noted that the inner belt loop created a way to get people out of the Heights. Councilmember Astle asked if the road would be accessed from roads other than Alkali Creek. Mr. Mumford reviewed the other roads that would connect to Alkali Creek. Councilmember Astle asked who would patrol the road. Mr. Mumford said it would be a county road so the law enforcement entities would review that procedure. He noted that fire was already out there.

Councilmember McCall asked if Mr. Mumford had discussed the road with the County Commissioners. Mr. Mumford responded that he reviewed the concept with the County’s Public Works Director, but would wait for Council’s reaction before he went further. Councilmember Veis asked if there was consideration of purchasing additional land for a future fire station. Mr. Mumford indicated he felt it would be best to locate that near Zimmerman Trail or near the Rod and Gun Club. Councilmember Veis suggested purchasing a couple of acres for a fire station while purchasing right-of-way. Mr. Mumford said one property owner was interested in that type of development or possibly even a dedication of land.

Councilmember Ulledalen said he felt the project made sense. He said it met good land use planning ideas and could help with more affordable housing.

Councilmember McCall said she and Councilmember Pitman visited Aviation and Transit the previous week. She said the inner belt loop would change the perspective of the airport from being on the edge of the City to being encompassed.

Councilmember Gaghen said the project addressed safety issues to provide access for emergency vehicles. She added that it was owed to that area to think ahead if a natural disaster ever occurred.

Councilmember Ulledalen commented that federal funds would get tighter so the City had to figure out how to pay for its own stuff. Mr. Mumford said utilizing federal funds required cash matches and extended timelines.

Councilmember Ulledalen commented that another situation that could cause a debacle was a plane crash that would take more than hours to clean up, more likely weeks and months.

Mr. Mumford said the design study would move forward if Council was in agreement.

Councilmember Stevens asked about an outer belt loop. Mr. Mumford advised that the last time he talked with MDT about it, the state indicated it was re-evaluating whether or not to move forward with that project. He noted that the last estimated cost was more than \$160 million and the alignment was closer to Lavina so the state was not sure how much traffic that would address. Councilmember Ulledalen said it was getting so far out, it was becoming a bypass. Councilmember Pitman said the original route meant removing about 300 homes which was probably why it moved further out.

Councilmembers agreed that the project should move forward.

TOPIC #4	<i>Riverfront Park Master Plan Update</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Park Planner Mark Jarvis advised he would provide a brief update on the status of the Riverfront Park Master Plan update. He reviewed the park master plan policy that required a master plan completion before any development occurred in a park. He noted that proposed modifications in the park required a master plan update to determine if that change was appropriate and acceptable for that park.

Mr. Jarvis explained that Riverfront Park was a 600-acre natural resource area that was a conservation and multi-functional area and was the most-used park in the park system. He reviewed the park boundaries.

Mr. Jarvis advised the need to update the master plan was due to the fact that the current plan in place was completed in 1982. He said there was significant development on the south end of Billings and there were new thoughts and ideas about the park. He added that parkland west of South Billings Boulevard was not included in the 1982 plan and that was another reason to update the master plan. He said the idea was to come up with a comprehensive plan to guide the development of the park.

Mr. Jarvis explained that the master plan process was intended to build grass roots support and consensus from the beginning; wanted to listen to stakeholders and their comments and ideas; and fostered public involvement and feedback. He noted that staff provided input and guidance, and a consultant collected the feedback and developed the draft plan.

Mr. Jarvis advised there were 16 different community groups that were identified and interviewed. He added that those groups were divided into smaller categories of: agencies or focus groups. Mr. Jarvis reviewed the community wide survey which had good response. He advised that two town hall meetings were held regarding the master plan process. He noted that participants in the town hall meetings were asked to record and submit comments and comments were also received by phone or through the website.

Mr. Jarvis reported that emerging themes from the comments received were that most people wanted to keep Riverfront Park in its current natural state and proposed minimal

development. He said people commented that the park could be more user-friendly with better trails, improved river access, and better access to South Billings Boulevard.

Mr. Jarvis reviewed plan elements and recommendations from that input as follows:

- Improved access to South Billings Boulevard
- Conservation Education Center
- Wendell's Bridge Trailhead & Norm's Island
- Trailhead West (a new entry point)
- Dutcher Trail Connections
- Hand boat launch (access for canoes and kayaks)
- Motorized boat launch
- Improved existing picnic areas
- Dog park
- Annexation of the park by City of Billings (currently in County)

Councilmember Stevens asked about previous discussion about a possible whitewater park. Mr. Jarvis indicated a kayak group was interested in that concept.

Councilmember Stevens stated she had seen boxes for life preserves at parks in Wyoming and wondered if the concept had been considered. Mr. Jarvis responded that he was not aware of that being considered but thought it was a good idea.

Councilmember Ulledalen asked if there were comments about the geese. Mr. Jarvis answered there were not many comments, but people did not like the mess they left behind.

Councilmember Ronquillo asked about the old box car property that could be used for additional parking. Mr. Jarvis said he had not heard any recent discussion about that.

Mayor Tussing asked about the criteria regarding the levels of support for the plan recommendations. Mr. Jarvis said he would have to review it further to be able to answer that.

Councilmember McCall asked how much the master plan cost and who performed the survey of the focus groups. Mr. Jarvis responded that a Colorado company, Invision, performed the survey and the master plan cost approximately \$68,000.

Councilmember Ronquillo asked if another meeting was scheduled. Mr. Jarvis reported that 25-30 people attended the first meeting; and only one person, a news reporter, attended the second meeting. He said the survey reached out to the community better than any other way in the past. He noted that community meetings did not garner large attendance.

Councilmember Gaghen asked if they felt the website comments were duplicates of what was gathered from the survey or if there was a way to judge that. Mr. Jarvis responded there was a wide range of things – some people commented because they could not attend the meetings; and some people had additional thoughts after attending the meetings. He estimated 25-30 website responses and an equal number of phone calls.

Councilmember Stevens stated she agreed with the Mayor and wanted to see the raw data rather than percentages for the survey responses. Mr. Jarvis explained that he could email that data.

Councilmember Ulledalen said the Cabela's website indicated the company participated in some local projects. He wondered if there was discussion about approaching them for funding any initiatives. Mr. Jarvis stated there were some comments on that. Mayor Tussing

said Cabela’s representatives previously indicated their desire to participate with local projects.

Councilmember Stevens asked about the status of a dog park. Mr. Jarvis reported that contact had been made with the Army Corps of Engineers because a permit was required if anything was needed within the floodplain and as part of that, a wetland assessment was needed which would have to be completed by consultants. He noted that assessment would cost \$2-3000 and there were no funds currently available for it.

Parks Director Mike Whitaker advised that the Montana Audubon Society was building an environmental science lab next to Riverfront Park. He introduced Paul Belanger from the State Audubon Society to provide a quick update on the Conservation Education Center. Mr. Belanger reviewed the background of the conservation center and plans for it. He said local teachers, educators and the City became involved in 1996 when they worked with Yellowstone River Parks Association and acquired the 27-acre gravel pit and created the conservation education center. He said the Montana Audubon Society was asked to oversee the center because of significant interest in the center and site. He noted the center was the first in the state and in an ideal location. He said the vision for the center was to serve the community and partner with schools as an outdoor classroom. Mr. Belanger said approximately 2200 students visited the site each year. He noted the most significant investment was the restoration and most of the equipment, materials and labor were donated. He advised that the science lab would allow outdoor studies to be brought inside for further exploration. He said the anticipated move-in date was November 1, 2008, with a grand opening in late spring or early summer.

Mr. Whitaker advised that he and Mr. Belanger had a great working relationship over the past year and partnered during the summer to offer nature camps that were filled to capacity. He noted that due to the high interest, more camps would probably be offered during the next summer season.

Mayor Tussing asked if there were other parks besides Riverfront and Phipps that were outside the City limits. Mr. Whitaker responded they were the only ones. Mayor Tussing said that had been an issue for a while now and he may have to have a Council initiative to annex those two parks. Councilmember Clark said there was no reason not to annex at least Riverfront because water and sewer were right next to it and it would eventually be surrounded by city property.

TOPIC #5	<i>Council Initiatives</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

City Administrator Volek distributed two documents; one was a list of completed initiatives and the other was a list of in-progress items.

Ms. Volek referenced an item on the in-progress list regarding a “no kill” shelter and said it was updated to reflect a meeting was held that day and that Council action was scheduled for 9/22/08.

Ms. Volek advised that the inner belt loop item was addressed that evening and would move forward.

Ms. Volek referenced the item regarding the feasibility of the sale of Lampman Park to use funds for Lampman Strip Park. She advised that a tennis association was previously

interested in the property, then decided to pursue another location, but was once again interested in that property. Councilmember Ulledalen stated that his neighbor was involved with that tennis association and had indicated to him that the association was more interested in Centennial Park. Mr. Whitaker noted that a hockey association had two to three years left on a lease for that park. Ms. Volek said staff could check if a clause applied that if the hockey association was not making substantial progress toward a permanent facility, it had to relinquish the lease. Councilmember Ulledalen advised that the tennis association hoped to create a partnership similar to the Par 3 golf course with cash flow that could be used to re-surface tennis courts in town.

Ms. Volek referenced an initiative regarding pet waste on school property and said she called the School District #2 Superintendent but had not received a response yet.

Ms. Volek referenced the state resort tax and said legal staff determined it was not discriminatory. City Attorney Brooks advised that Craig Hensel from his office prepared a memo that would be distributed to Council.

Ms. Volek stated she and Councilmember Clark discussed the Central Avenue speed limit and the speed study results. She said she asked the Police Chief to put the speed wagon in that area and to follow-up with additional enforcement as time permitted. Councilmember Clark said he still hoped to have the speed limit reduced to 35 mph from 27th to Shiloh Road on Central. Ms. Volek advised that the warrants set the speed limits. She said a presentation was made at a work session a few years ago regarding the warrant system. Councilmember Astle said the area was likely more rural when the 45 mph speed limit was established, but since that time, housing and other businesses were there and 45 mph seemed to be a minimum speed limit.

Ms. Volek referenced two items on the last page regarding the feasibility of freezing water rates for Low Energy Assistance Program participants; and the feasibility of selling naming rights for small, unnamed parks, golf fees and selling memorials in city parks.

Councilmembers mentioned that residents were calling them to complain about water bills and were told to do so by the Water Department.

Councilmember Veis advised that the item regarding amending PCC bylaws should not be on the completed list.

A recess was taken 8:20-8:30 p.m.

Councilmember Veis left the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

TOPIC #6	<i>Strategic Plan – Council Goals & Objectives</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

The remainder of the meeting was not recorded electronically. The following bullet points were recreated from hand-written notes taken during the meeting.

- Councilmembers were asked at a previous meeting to individually review the Draft Strategic Plan Goals and rank their top 10 goals. Those would be collated and reflected on a scattergram.

- Councilmember Ulledalen goals:
 - City Council serves as ambassadors
 - Open & Accessible Government, Actions 7 & 8
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Objective 1, Action 3 (ranked as #1)
 - Transportation Linkages, Objective 1, Action 4 & 6
 - Preservation of Resources -- sell land and use the funds elsewhere.
 - Preservation of Resources, COT/Library branch, add SD 2
 - Economic Development, Objective 4, Action 1
 - Involved United Community, work with Celebrate Billings to figure out Plan B

- Councilmember Veis turned his list of goals in to Councilmember Ulledalen

- Councilmember Gaghen's goals ranked in order of importance:
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal 2, Objective 1, Goal 1
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal 1, Objective 2, Action 1
 - Economic Development, Objective 4, Action 1
 - Economic Development, Objective 4, Action 3
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 1
 - Comprehensive Orderly Growth, Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 3
 - Transportation Linkages, Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 7
 - Transportation Linkages, Goal1, Objective 2, Action 1
 - Involved, United Community, Goal 1
 - Economic Development, Goal 1, Objective 5, Action 3

- Councilmember Ruegamer's goals ranked in order of importance:
 - Economic Development, Goal 1, Objective 4, Action 2
 - Economic Development, Goal 1, Objective 4, Action 1
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal 1, Objective 2, Action 2
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal 1, Objective 2, Action 3
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal1 1, Action 1
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal1 2, Action 1
 - Transportation Linkages, Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 7
 - Economic Development, Goal 1, Objective 5, Action 2
 - Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 2a (page 2)
 - Goal 2, Objective 1, Action 4
 - Comprehensive, Orderly Growth, Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 3

- Councilmember Pitman would provide his goals in writing.
- Councilmember Astle would email his goals.
- The Strategic Plan would be reviewed at the next work session.
- Councilmember Stevens listed her goals:
 - work to be nicer to citizens
 - code enforcement
 - new ideas – looking for ways things would work
- Councilmember Ulledalen: referenced the 2002 ordinance regarding EMS service and the need to consider updating it.
- Councilmember Stevens stated Billings was going to grow and there would be a need to think outside the box.
- Councilmember McCall referenced the need for decorum and level respect in Council for people who came forward at meetings. She said the bar needed to be raised.
- Councilmember Ruegamer said that had nothing to do with the goals.
- Mayor Tussing listed Economic Development, Goal 1, Objective 1, Action 4
- Councilmember Clark stated citizens should know they could contact Councilmembers

<p>Additional Information:</p>

- Councilmember Ruegamer referenced Tourist Tax -- 60% within entity; 40% outside tourists, Wyoming, small towns.
- Against 25% - means people in surrounding towns received more.
- Jeff Essman was pushing Dept. of Revenue.
- Councilmember Ruegamer opposed to sending to state for ICAP.
- Larry (last name illegible) said the tourist tax was needed.

- Eight other cities greater than 5500 – Livingston, Hamilton, Anaconda. Councilmember Ruegamer to provide list.
- When would cities outgrow the 5500 limit?
- Councilmember Ruegamer would go to Helena to Legislative group. Would go with no more than 10%.
- Councilmember Ronquillo commented that a percentage should go back to people
- Councilmember Ruegamer stated the need to sell the idea to cities and decide how much to give back. Do not want the state to decide how much.
- Councilmember Clark asked how much Whitefish gave back. Councilmember Ruegamer answered 25%.
- Councilmember Ronquillo asked about timing.
- Councilmember Gaghen said multiple units come up.
- Councilmember Ruegamer: Raise cap, sunset – do not tell what tax.