

City Council Work Session

April 21, 2008
5:30 PM
Community Center

ATTENDANCE:

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

ADJOURN TIME: 7:50 p.m.

Agenda

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

There were no speakers so the public comment period was closed.

TOPIC #2	<i>Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Advisory Board Annual Presentation</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Director Mike Whitaker introduced Tom Iverson, Chairman of the Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Advisory Board. Mr. Iverson reported that the approximate 2,700 acres of parkland consisted of various types of usage in the form of a skate park, a cemetery, pools, a golf course and a minor league baseball stadium. He said the department contained four divisions: Administration, which operated the city parks and recreation system; Parks, which maintained the parklands and assisted with activity set-ups; Recreation, which oversaw the pools, skate park and community centers; and Cemetery, which maintained and operated Mountview and Billings Cemeteries.

Mr. Iverson stated that the PRPL Advisory Board identified the following goals for the Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Department:

- *Complete a Parks and Recreation Needs Assessment to determine current and future program needs for the city.*
- *Update the City Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan.* The plan was prepared in 1997 and titled The 20/20 Plan.
- *Update the Pioneer Park Master Plan.* The update was needed due to the disc golf neighborhood user concerns. He said that had been an issue for a few years and the way to deal with it was to update the master plan, obtain public input and make a decision from there.
- *Acquire and develop regional parks.* The subdivision regulations needed to be updated to include park development guidelines.

Councilmember Veis said he thought the subdivision regulations were recently updated. Planning Director Candi Beaudry said those regulations were updated in 2006 but didn't include new language for parks. Mr. Whitaker said that from a parks perspective, it was necessary to develop guidelines and standards related to park development in subdivisions. He said a problem was that developers developed parks that didn't meet the current standards, so it was important that the standards were included in subdivision regulations. Mr. Iverson added that the regulations also needed to address the types of lots donated to the City because developers tended to donate the least desirable lots that weren't suitable for parkland. He said increased cooperation was needed between developers, planners and the Parks Department before development was put into play.

- *Develop a reliable funding source for trail construction and maintenance.*
- *Pursue right of way agreements with ditch companies.* He said the ditch companies weren't too happy about allowing anyone near the ditches, but he understood it was done in other cities and the ditch company's liability could be limited.
- *Develop a departmental marketing plan to market the Parks Department services.*
- *Enforce park use permits and insurance requirements.* He said groups used the parks without obtaining the permits or insurance requirements.
- *Funding.* The Board felt the City needed to explore the possibility of a parks and recreation district to help with parkland acquisition, development and maintenance costs.
- *Continue to encourage financial donations and provide volunteer opportunities.* He said everyone was probably aware of Harvest Church in the Heights which had re-roofed the South Park swimming pool building and held a number of work days at the cemetery to raise sunken stones. He said he felt that other groups would be willing to help if the opportunities were marketed to them.

Mr. Iverson reviewed current projects Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Department as:

- Briarwood Master Plan
- Dehler Park
- A dog park
- Riverfront Park Master Plan
- Complete a park inventory
- Partner with Montana Audubon Association for nature camps at Riverfront Park
- Partner with Billings Mustangs for baseball clinics at the new stadium

Councilmember Ulledalen asked about disposal of unused parkland. Mr. Iverson said it was a possibility with some of the undeveloped parks. He said Centennial Park had a lease agreement with a group for an ice hockey arena which he didn't think would happen and that could be an extremely valuable piece of land. He said a parks inventory should address that. He said he believed an inventory was completed 10-15 years ago and some parks were actually sold as a result of it. Councilmember Ulledalen said he heard the hockey group had a limitless lease on that ground for about \$30 per year. Mr. Iverson said that was true, but there was a clause in the lease that if progress toward building a facility wasn't made, the City could terminate the lease. Mr. Iverson said all the lease agreements would be reviewed and he thought the Board was inclined to terminate that particular lease due to inactivity. He noted that a tennis association requested the same deal at that park or another park, so the City needed to decide if it wanted to enter into that type of agreement.

Councilmember Ronquillo said every time he obtained a permit for South Park usage, the Police had to be called to remove the transients then cleanup had to be done before the area could be used. He said if he paid for a permit he expected the area to be cleaned up and ready to use. He advised that the previous Saturday he was at the park with a group and filled three trash cans with garbage that needed to be cleaned up and there were 15 transients in the park the same day. Mr. Iverson said the transient problem was not a Parks Department problem, but a Police Department problem. He noted that the permit fee was for the use of the park. Mr. Iverson said ordinances were needed, if none existed, so fines could be issued to people who used the park without permits.

Councilmember Ronquillo said 30 trees were removed from South Park and hadn't been replaced yet despite Mr. Whitaker's indication that trees would be planted by last fall. He said a letter was sent to the Parks Director and it stated that if a tree was removed, a new one should be planted because the parks were intended for shady spots. Mr. Iverson said the Parks Board wasn't involved in the tree issue. Mr. Whitaker said some trees were re-planted in South Park. He explained that the tree replacement program called for replacement of 25-50 trees each year and he believed South Park was on the list for trees during the current year. He said the funding cycled each year and when he and Councilmember Ronquillo visited last year, he didn't realize it was at the end of the fund cycle. He said the new trees would be planted in the fall. He noted that the reason trees were removed was from a safety standpoint. Councilmember Ronquillo said that the trees removed were 60 years old so it was imperative that when one tree was removed, another was planted in its place right away.

Councilmember Gaghen said Council should express special recognition and support to the PRPL Advisory Board. She noted that it was active and worked hard, especially with the building of the new baseball facility.

TOPIC #3	<i>Dehler Park Grand Opening Plans</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Parks, Recreation and Public Lands Director Mike Whitaker provided an update on plans for an opening ceremony at Dehler Park. He said that not all events were set, but plans were being made. He said a committee was formed and all baseball organizations in town would be involved. He noted that the draft agenda for the June 29 opening day included a clinic or something fun for kids at 12:30 p.m., followed by an afternoon open house, statue dedications of Dave McNally and Ed Bayne, and a little league parade of teams. Mr. Whitaker stated there would also be an American Legion game that day with a ribbon cutting prior to the game with speakers that are yet to be finalized. He said invitations were sent to elected officials who were instrumental in securing funding for the scoreboard. Mr. Whitaker said that the junior and senior little league championship games would be held on Monday night, June 30. He indicated that the program was evolving and events could be added. He said it was going to be a two-day event so City organizations could participate. Councilmember Astle asked when the next tour would be held; Mr. Whitaker replied that May 2, at 3 p.m. would be last tour prior to the opening.

TOPIC #4	<i>CDBG/HOME Allocation Process</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Community Development Manager Brenda Beckett introduced Duane Loken, Chair of the Community Development Board. Mr. Loken advised that Ms. Beckett would make a presentation and provided a letter from the Board regarding funding recommendations for the activities and organizations considered. He said that as funding levels decreased, it was a challenge to fund all the programs but the Board worked hard to serve as many low income people as possible.

Ms. Beckett advised that there was a decreased funding history with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and the HOME program. She explained that the CDBG program began in the 1970s and replaced federal urban renewal. The current year was the smallest allocation since 1994. She noted that a packet would be provided for the April 28 public hearing and for the action planned for May 12. She stated that the funding for that program declined as war funding increased. She said the program was under a great deal of scrutiny with the federal government, and President Bush's proposed budget provided 25% less than the current year. She explained that Staff and the Community Development Board recommended that when funding fell below \$500,000, public services would not be funded which would be tremendously unpopular. She said Board members went to each organization and became great advocates for the people served by those programs, but that had nothing to do with the way the City allocated the funds.

Ms. Beckett's presentation illustrated the funding levels for the different programs. She noted that the largest funding went to the home repair and improvement programs, first time homebuyers and affordable housing and development programs. She said all of the mentioned programs served the 0-80% median income group. She said the current year's recommendations were the same for affordable housing and first time homebuyers and home repair programs. She stated that Administration was limited to 15% of the funds so she appreciated the Finance Departments assistance to keep cost allocation charges down.

Ms. Beckett explained that the application process started in November with the Community Development Board's approval of the application form and required documents; and then applications were available in December and due in January. She stated that task forces rated the projects and the Community Development Board conducted site visits to public service agencies early in the year. Ms. Beckett distributed a chart which showed the allocation process and noted that public hearings were scheduled for 2 days in March of each year and the April Board meeting established the funding recommendations which were then presented to the Council. She said it was put together into a consolidated plan and forwarded to HUD by the May 15 deadline.

Ms. Beckett advised that the Community Development Board preferred loans rather than grants, but voted to recommend grant funding allocations to the City Council for CDBG and HOME funds. She said the Board struggled with the issue and tried to figure out how the organizations could repay loan proceeds because the organizations had below zero budgets. She said the Board reviewed task force preferences and priorities, applicant leveraging from other sources and prioritized housing activities. She noted that applications and summaries would be provided to Councilmembers and were also available on line.

Ms. Beckett reviewed public agency funding priorities. She said the intent was that projects met basic health and safety needs with the funding it received. She noted that other considerations were whether other funding sources were available and funds the agency contributed or leveraged.

Ms. Beckett reviewed the connections between CDBG and HOME funding recommendations. She explained that Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) funding was intended for community based organizations that had a mission to develop housing. She said it was required to allocate and spend the funds in a timely manner.

Councilmember Ulledalen asked for the definition of affordable housing. Ms. Beckett responded that it was 0 – 80% of the area median household income. She said area median income for a family of 4 at 80% was \$53,400. Councilmember Ruegamer asked for clarification of how the 80% of median income principle worked. Ms. Beckett explained that HUD calculated the area median income; so products had to be affordable and a house or rental payment couldn't exceed 30% of the applicant's adjusted gross income. She said there was a grid to know what people could afford based on their income level. Councilmember Ruegamer stated that he would like to see the chart. City Administrator Volek said the Council most often saw the median income figure that was determined by MSU-B, which was approximately \$34,000. She noted that the federal government had a different chart.

Mr. Loken said it was stressful for the Board to rate the applications because groups requested about twice the amount of money that was available for allocation. Ms. Beckett explained that the Community Development Board was scheduled to review recommendations for public services May 6. She said due to an error that caused over-commitment, the Board's recommendation was to fund 90.75% of the public service project funding requests. Councilmember Ruegamer commented that he attended some Community Development Board meetings and it was a good board. He said there were 36 groups that received funds and in his own opinion, it was more beneficial to give more money to fewer organizations. He added that he served on two of the 36 boards and wouldn't recommend funds for either organization. Councilmember Ronquillo said he agreed with Councilmember Ruegamer. He said he was on a Board to simply listen in and the Chairman told him that the Board thought his presence would be intimidating so he didn't have to attend all the meetings. He said he wanted to emphasize that Council made the final decisions and more Councilmembers should be involved with the Board to see how the funds were allocated. He said he didn't agree with spreading the money so thin. Ms. Beckett responded that a great deal of research was conducted last fall regarding national information and service agencies. She said that some agencies agreed that the money could be better served elsewhere, but the Board decided to continue its past practice until Council gave it a clear directive. Mr. Loken reiterated that at Council's request, the issue was visited last year and letters were sent to the service organizations for suggestions of ways to distribute the funds. He said although the response wasn't clear cut, there still seemed to be enough feedback to continue the way it had been done in the past, and even though fewer funds served more organizations, more individuals were served. He said the Board looked at getting the biggest bang for the buck. Councilmember Ulledalen asked if the Board knew what percentage of the total budgets the came from the CDBG funds. Ms. Beckett said the application asked for that information and also asked the amount of money each group leveraged.

Councilmember Gaghen stated that she served on the Community Development Board for eight years; four of those years as chair. She said when the federal government first allowed funds to be distributed to public service agencies; the money was intended as seed money to inspire the groups to become independent. She said that happened in some cases, but there was also a greater consideration on the part of the Board to instill interest in raising other funds. She said it served as a springboard to get organizations to seek other funding sources. She applauded the Board for its work and said she felt it tried to be as fair and equitable as possible. Councilmember Clark asked if it was possible to receive information about how long some organizations received funds. Ms. Beckett replied that she would prepare a list for as many as she could research. Councilmember Clark stated that he felt some of the organizations didn't have enough incentive to break away from CDBG and find their own funding sources.

Councilmember Gaghen noted that the Board didn't allow organizations to carry money forward; it had to be spent.

Councilmember Veis asked how the Big Sky Economic Development Authority justified its funding request. Ms. Beckett responded that its request was compelling and the Board had clear concerns. The argument was that it provided business development services to low income individuals. Mr. Loken said the Board was also very definite in its directive that funds were directed strictly to the low income sector. Councilmember Veis said BSEDA had received funds for as long as he had been on the Council so he wondered if it was dependent upon the funds. Ms. Beckett responded that the money was used for supplies every year to run the Business Development Center. She noted that CDBG was the only program she knew about that allowed the fund to pay staff in the service groups.

Councilmember Ronquillo advised that some organizations received grant funds for many years and used the funds to pay wages. He said there were organizations that collected mill levy funds that still returned with a funding request. He said he felt there was a need for a different process. He said multiple organizations duplicated services and shouldn't all be funded.

Councilmember Veis agreed that he didn't think Council wanted it to go this way, but if it didn't listen to the Community Development Board, Council would end up doing the work. He suggested a Council initiative to set program guidelines and a policy so there wasn't any confusion about what the policy body wanted to see. Mr. Loken said he welcomed that.

Councilmember Gaghen stated that she could name four organizations that started with CDBG funds and were on the list perennially, but grew and no longer need the CDBG money. She said those organizations were encouraged and had positive appeal. She said the Board supported organizations who weaned themselves from CDBG and there was success with that concept.

Ms. Beckett stated that the Board suggested a half-day session with Council to work out those guidelines. She said it would be best if the changes were made prior to the next application cycle so applicants knew what to expect in terms of the process. She stated that Staff's recommendation was for Council's approval of this year's allocations and a change before next year.

TOPIC #5	<i>City MS4 Stormwater Program</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Public Works Director Dave Mumford introduced Environmental Engineer Boris Krizek to address the MS4 Stormwater Program. Mr. Mumford stated that regulations had to be passed in order to meet standards because if water ran off the curb and down a storm drain, the federal regulations were violated because the water contained chlorine.

Mr. Krizek said the program was Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). He said that a separate storm collection system and a separate sanitary system made the City eligible for the program. He defined stormwater as runoff of natural precipitation, such as rainwater, snow melt, or any other surface discharge and drainage. He reviewed pollutants of concern and the total maximum daily load (TMDL) on the watersheds throughout the state. He said DEQ had to test the TMDL on all waterways by 2012. He said that could have a significant impact on the program in the future.

Mr. Krizek said a 1987 law started the stormwater regulation and in 2003, the regulations applied to Billings. He advised that in 2005, Billings obtained its first NPDES Phase II storm

water discharge permit and began programs and practices to control polluted stormwater runoff. He said another permit would have to be obtained in 2009 and the standards would likely be tougher. He said the key point of the program was minimum control measures: best management practices, measurable goals, partnerships, implementation schedule and evaluations/assessment efforts, reporting and recordkeeping. He noted that another component was to monitor stormwater vents. He said when a storm front hit, samples from the stormwater collection system were tested for various minerals. He said that the three sampling cycles to date exceeded the median concentrations of the general permit. He said other communities were in the same situation. He said it was necessary to detect and eliminate illicit discharges – one of the hardest things for cities to do. He advised that discharges were the City's responsibility even though it didn't control the upstream discharges. Mr. Mumford said the state regulations indicated that the City was required to clean what came from it.

Mr. Krizek said it was estimated there were 300 suspected connections in the downtown area, and it would cost about \$450,000-\$600,000 to eliminate those connections, and that cost didn't include location and verification of the connections. Councilmember Astle asked what was considered an illicit connection. Mr. Krizek said some could be septic, old sewer cross connections, floor drains, or several other sources. He said there was a question of who had to pay for the cleanup. He said it may require an assessment structure to pay for detecting and shutting off these sources.

Mr. Krizek advised that construction site stormwater runoff control was an issue. He said ordinances could require certain control measures. He said a stormwater management manual would be updated. He noted that site plan reviews and site visits would be held to make sure best management practices were used. Mr. Krizek stated that other best management practices included public education and outreach. He noted that school programs were presented, an educational display was at a science fair, and presentations were made to local organizations.

Mr. Krizek reviewed a map of the stormwater system. He pointed out ten outfalls to the Yellowstone River and stated that he wasn't sure what was needed to address the stormwater pollution issue. He noted that it could require detention/retention facilities which could cost as much as \$5 million. He advised that a draft ordinance would be presented to address construction and illicit discharge and elimination and there would likely be fee increases proposed to fund the program. Mr. Krizek showed slides of best management practices for construction sites.

Councilmember Veis stated that it was a good time to point out how important the TMDL process was for Billings because once again, it would be easier to go to the 9 outfalls to make sure that the City met the TMDLs than it would be to go to the 90 farmers upstream to make them meet the TMDL limits. He noted it was important to make sure there was a proportionate share as part of the TMDL process.

City Administrator Volek advised that she was in Helena last week and was asked to serve on a lead committee to work with DEQ on TMDL standards. She said a scientific study should be completed by June or July that addressed the requirements and the problems. She indicated that there would be an opportunity for comments and the committee would explore the affordability because of the costs of the projects and the effect on communities. She said one concession was that if cities took in areas, like Lockwood, the TMDL for the total watershed would be considered and cities would get credit for reducing the load in the total watershed. She noted that cities like Helena in small watersheds faced huge costs.

Councilmember Ronquillo asked if it was possible to cover some of the ditches to keep people from dumping in them. Mr. Mumford responded that it was expensive and grass and other vegetation helped settle and filter some of the discharges. Ditch elevations didn't always work well for city stormwater discharge.

TOPIC #6	<i>Website and Credit Card Acceptance</i>
PRESENTER	
NOTES/OUTCOME	

Financial Services Manager Pat Weber said he was excited to implement the credit card acceptance because it had been talked about for five years. He stated that the last Request for Proposals (RFP) for banking services included costs for credit card acceptance/processing. He advised that US Bank, the provider of the City's bank services, was partnered with NOVA, the largest credit card processing firm in the country, so that worked well with low costs and their depth of experience. He stated that eventually checks would be scanned, a process whereby the check is turned into a debit transaction, but for now the credit card processing was running and the check scanning would start later. He noted that the machine purchased processed both types of items. He stated that the counter staff began training and the remaining staff should complete training in mid-May. Mr. Weber advised that the next step was to accept credit card payments via the internet with the new website.

Mr. Weber explained the Compensating Municipal Investor Account. He stated that the bank estimated what was needed to cover bank fees and if the charges at the end of the year were less than the interest paid on the funds in the account, the bank retained the excess funds. He said there was about \$18,000 in credit at the end of last year and the bank representative allowed him to purchase \$15,000 worth of equipment without having to use up-front dollars because it was money that would have been lost. He noted that all transactions were run through NOVA's server and there was no credit card information on the City's system. He said the system accepted MasterCard, VISA and debit cards. He advised that when a deal between NOVA and American Express was negotiated; the City could accept American Express as well.

Mayor Tussing asked about the fees and who paid them. Mr. Weber responded that he didn't have the information with him but would send it in the Friday packet. He said the fees ran through the Compensating MIA account so customers weren't charged the extra fee. Councilmember Clark asked what the cost was to the City. Mr. Weber said the reserves were put into the Compensating MIA account and the interest earned on that account paid the credit card fees so there was no direct cost to any fund.

Councilmember Ruegamer asked if it reduced some costs, such as NSF checks. Mr. Weber responded that there were two processes: guarantee checks, the process to be implemented in Municipal Court, or the check turned into a debit. He said the money should get to the City quicker without the float on checks and the NSF costs should be reduced. Councilmember Veis asked if there should be a dollar limit at which point a fee was charged. Mr. Weber said a fee couldn't be charged to a selected group, it was either charged or not and that was regulated by the credit card company.

Councilmember Gaghen asked if checks received by mail would be scanned and processed as a debit. Mr. Weber said checks received by mail couldn't be scanned and if someone presented one in person and didn't want it scanned, it couldn't be scanned by the City.

Mr. Weber said new equipment would be installed at the Library and Police department; the Building Division and Municipal Court would get new and additional equipment, and other departments were scheduled to receive equipment in the future. Mr. Weber said that US Bank automatically batched the transactions daily so the funds could be posted immediately; and Friday, Saturday and Sunday transactions posted on Monday. He stated that he was in the

process of writing a procedures manual. He noted that it was an ongoing process and the training and oversight would continue.

Mayor Tussing asked how many other cities took credit cards. Mr. Weber said Missoula was the only other city he knew of and Yellowstone County took cards for vehicle plates, but charged a fee.

City Administrator Volek reported that this item was a Council initiative. Councilmember Ronquillo stated that he had several individuals ask about the use of credit cards to pay utility bills and fines and he felt it would be helpful. City Administrator Volek said an advantage was that the system was City-wide and the rules and regulations were followed uniformly across the organization. She said the City had a considerable float on its money and this eliminated some of it.

Information Technology Manager David Watterson stated that he was excited to discuss the City's new website redesign, scheduled to go live on Monday, April 28. Mr. Watterson said publicity was pretty extensive with December and April City Link articles; a press release scheduled for distribution next week and an interview with Community 7 that would be aired the week of May 5. He acknowledged the City Council for its vision and support, the Administration and staff that worked extensively, the iTAC Advisory Committee, and a smaller core group that provided input and guidance. He also recognized Dee Ann Redman and Brent Brooks for their contributions and leadership and gave special credit to Network Administrator Deb Schmitt, who was the project leader on his team.

Mr. Watterson noted that the website had a uniform design and would contain a "report a concern" module which would be available to citizens 24/7. He provided a site demonstration and highlighted future options that would be added to the site as it was developed. Councilmembers asked general questions about where the search function resided, how updates were done, if a Councilmember could update its site independently or with assistance, navigation through the site as a citizen, statistics regarding public use of the site, and how sites were updated by department. There was consensus that Councilmembers wanted links or options for each of their pages on the site. Councilmember Pitman asked if there was a provision for advertising by other entities. Mr. Watterson responded that the resource directory provided information about services but it would be monitored to limit it to non-profit organizations.

City Administrator Volek reported that CivicPlus provided good preparation by researching the types of questions received by departments to determine the information needed on the site. Councilmember Gaghen asked if people that didn't use the website to make payments could pay with a credit card by phone. Ms. Redman answered that she checked the equipment and the capability to do that was there.

Councilmember Pitman suggested that Council and staff email signature blocks contained the City website address.

City Administrator Volek expressed appreciation to Council for its financial contribution toward the project and stated that other City departments made contributions from current operating budgets. She said there was a small annual maintenance fee but the basic work was completed with contributions from operating budgets so the site could be up and running.

Mr. Watterson said there were increased features and functionality for staff too.

Additional Information:

City Administrator Volek announced that City Attorney Brent Brooks had a brief update on disc golf (folf). Mr. Brooks distributed a brief memo from himself and Deputy City Attorney Craig Hensel who completed a bulk of the research. He said he spoke with MMIA again and

reviewed the definition of a projectile. He said it was MMIA's, Craig's and his assessment that the risk of liability to the City for golf activity was no greater than any other outdoor, open space activity. He added that MMIA recommended no special signage on the disc golf course because any time something was identified as dangerous; it elevated the responsibility to monitor the activity. He stated that if discs were defined as projectiles, the ordinance needed to be amended if golf activity was to be prohibited. He said a sub-issue was that Council could confine the activity to certain parks or areas of parks. He said that in the end, it was a policy decision. He reiterated that the liability was no greater for it than for other activities that were allowed in Pioneer Park.

Councilmember Pitman asked if MMIA would cover any losses to the City and Mr. Brooks responded that it would. Councilmember Veis stated that the issue confirmed the need for an updated Master Plan for Pioneer Park and a decision was needed whether the game would be allowed there. Mr. Brooks said the projectile definition could be updated.

Mayor Tussing asked if the liability was any different since the course was established there. Mr. Brooks responded that MMIA didn't think the liability was any greater, possibly less because the area was designated for the activity. Councilmember Clark stated that the activity wasn't authorized from the outset, but after the fact it was allowed. Mr. Brooks stated that the City may not have allowed it, but a course was created and then the City established a formal course.

Councilmember Veis stated that he needed to correct a statement he made at the April 14 meeting. He said that Monad and Shiloh would be a full intersection, even though it was one-half mile from King and Central.

Councilmember Ulledalen reported that the County was increasingly interested in phasing the Bench Blvd. project and Shiloh Road as well. He said the discussion came from the PCC meeting. He added that Zimmerman money may not be moved to the Shiloh project because there was some resistance from the Senate. He advised that Montana League of Cities and Towns was working on Montana Department of Transportation's new maintenance agreement language regarding sidewalk maintenance on MDT projects. Councilmember Veis said there was a stakeholders meeting April 28.

Councilmember Ronquillo asked how to move the State Avenue project forward. City Administrator Volek said she would check on it.