

MINUTES
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM COMMITTEE AGENDA
8:00 A.M., September 21, 2018

A Capital Improvements Program Committee meeting was held at the City/School Administration Center in Rapid City South Dakota, on Friday, September 21, 2018 at 8:03 a.m.

The following members were present: Ritchie Nordstrom, Amanda Scott, Jason Salamun and Darla Drew; the following members arrived during the course of the meeting: none; and the following were absent: Lisa Modrick

Others present included: Finance Officer Pauline Sumption, IT Director Jim Gilbert, Parks and Recreation Director Jeff Biegler, Police Chief Karl Jegeris, Compliance Specialist Cassie Furchner, Public Works Director Dale Tech, Community Planning Director Ken Young, and Administrative Coordinator Heidi Weaver-Norris.

Motion was made by Salamun, second by Drew and carried to adopt the agenda.

CONSENT ITEMS – Items 3-8

3. **Approve Minutes** for August 17, 2018
4. **Next Meeting:** Friday, October 19, 2018 @ 8:00 a.m./2nd Floor Council Chambers
5. No. CIP092118-03 – Approve Capital Plans for **Government Facilities** – (Fire & Emergency Services, Parks & Recreation, CSAC, Summary)
6. No. CIP092118-04 – Approve Capital Plan for **Fire Vehicles**
7. No. CIP092118-05 – Approve Capital Plan for **Parks & Recreation**
8. No. CIP092118-06 – Approve Capital Plan for **Information Technology**

NON-CONSENT ITEMS – Items 9 – 11

Nordstrom read in item (No. CIP092118-01) Acknowledge **Financial Report** (Summary, DCA Charges and Debt Service). Sumption said there was nothing to note for this month. Motion was made by Drew, second by Scott and carried to acknowledge.

Nordstrom read in item (No. CIP092118-02) Approve Capital Plan for PW Infrastructure (*Formerly called Capital Plan for Streets, Drainage, MIP Projects*). Furchner said there were minor notations. She said the current status of each project had been updated. She went over the green highlighted areas. Nordstrom asked about the \$462 for trees down on Maple Ave. Furchner said she would look into that. Motion was made by Scott, second by Salamun and carried to approve.

Nordstrom read in item (No. CIP092118-07) 2019 Body-Cam CIP Funding Request by Karl Jegeris. He requested that \$100,000 that was previously approved in the 5-year plan for public area surveillance be reallocated for the purpose of the 2019 body cam contract obligation. The police department is obligated to pay \$175,000 in 2019. \$75,000 of that is covered by the Department of Justice grant. He had originally wanted to get the \$100,000 from the general budget request but the Mayor needed cuts in the budget. PD had to cut \$490,000 out of their budget so they needed a different funding source. He said they could no longer afford the public area surveillance cameras at this time. He thinks it would be appropriate to transfer that money to cover the body cam contract. He stated the equipment is not owned by the police department. He said the data is owned by the department which is stored in an external cloud. Motion was made by Salamun, second by Scott. In response to a question from Salamun, Jegeris said the \$100,000 was written as a program offer to the Mayor but it was never included in the budget. Salamun asked Jegeris what the city is missing out on by not pursuing the public area surveillance. Jegeris said public area surveillance is a progressive technology that is being used in some larger cities and it has a big impact on detouring crime. It is used on public areas, typically high crime areas that are recorded. They are also used in key intersections. The cameras monitor activity 24/7. When a crime occurs it is recorded. The faster you can solve a crime, more crime is detoured. Jegeris said they can't afford at this time. Down the road, they can reconsider and possibly apply for more grants to get this service. Salamun asked when body cams will be running. Jegeris said they are currently operating and the program is going well. They have already made their 2018 payment. They have a 5-year contract with this company. If the contract doesn't get paid, it will be a step back which he doesn't recommend. Sumption said since this request is for infrastructure, such as software and cloud backup, it would qualify for CIP funds. Scott asked Jegeris if the public area surveillance could include the county. She asked if he has approached them regarding a combined effort to purchase these cameras. He has not. He said it's worthy of a

discussion with them. Drew said videos have been a game-changer in society. She asked if body cam footage has been used in any court cases. Jegeris said it has been used. He stated the footage makes offenders accountable. Drew asked for clarification on funding. Jegeris said there is currently \$100,000 allocated for public area surveillance in 2018, he is asking that those funds be reallocated to cover the body cam contract in 2019. He stated the funding has been approved, it just needs to be reallocated. In response to a question from Nordstrom, Jegeris said there is a policy in place regarding the body cams. They surveyed the community, ACLU, and did best practice with other departments throughout the nation. He said they have a very comprehensive policy. Jegeris said he could send council a link to the policy. He said it was also available on their web page under rules and procedures. Online address is www.rapidcitypolice.org. Salamun said the questions are coming out of curiosity and if council is curious the public is likely curious as well. Jegeris said he understood and welcomed the interest. Motion approved.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Nordstrom read in item (No. CIP092118-08) Explanation of the CIP Ordinance guidelines and policies to understand more clearly what is expected of the CIP Committee for planning and boundaries or limitations of the Committee. He said he brought the item forward so the committee could understand more clearly about the guidelines and policies for CIP. Nordstrom asked Sumption to go over the ordinance and how the funds are originated and divided up. When the council approved the reallocation of sales tax, the general fund receives 50% of the 2% sales tax (or half of the sales tax revenue). The CIP and vision fund receives the other half, which is split between the two with 58% going to CIP and 42% going to Vision. As part of that process, the city eliminated the utility support fund, which was absorbed by the CIP fund. At the time there was .16 of the 2 cent tax that would go into that but that ended up getting split between the general fund and CIP also. So that's why there are some of those projects within the plan. Nordstrom said the policy reads that the committee will approve a 5-year plan for financing projects. He said in March of every year the CIP committee comes forward with a budget proposal and they approve it in April. He said to take the sales tax collection they see on legal and finance committee agenda and determine the percentage coming in. Take that and divide it up by 58% and 42% and they will get an idea of what is going into CIP and the Vision Fund. It's a mirror of the sales tax collection that goes into the general fund. Motion made by Scott, second by Salamun to acknowledge the discussion. Drew said she can't ever see taking more out of vision funds for CIP. She said the citizens have voted for improving the quality of life with the vision funds and she wants to make sure it stays with its original intent. Nordstrom said there was a discussion point about the policy they have in place for the public works infrastructure projects, the primary focus will be based upon rehabilitation, joint projects with utilities and infill development. Nordstrom asked Tech for information and asked him to explain the difference between maintenance and capital projects. Tech said he could try and give a division wide comparison. He said they have the street department and they maintain the streets. They fill in potholes and fix minor things. If there is something that needs done that is more than what they can do, and meets the guidelines for public works infrastructure funding out of CIP, then that's the method they use to keep infrastructure in good shape. CIP used to rehab infrastructure and keep street inventory in a serviceable condition. Nordstrom said taking the 58% of the second penny is used for different allocations in public works, parks and recreation, government facilities, IT, and fire vehicles. Nordstrom asked Sumption if fire is going to be taking the vehicles out of CIP. She said they intended to but when cuts came around, it wasn't feasible. Another allocation for the second penny is interdepartmental charges. To clarify, Sumption said the allocation is set by policy not ordinance. She said council sets the policy and they are the ones who can change it. Scott asked why the discussion item was being brought up. Nordstrom said the information gives the general idea of what takes place in CIP. He said he feels the new members of the committee are going through a learning curve. Scott said Nordstrom was using this as a discussion item but isn't proposing anything. She feels this item would be better in a council working session. Sumption said the item was mostly put on the agenda for Salamun and Modrick since they are new to the committee. Sumption stated that Modrick brought up drainage at the last CIP meeting but drainage has its own enterprise fund and funding source so it's not eligible for CIP. We don't look at water and sewer CIP projects. We typically look at projects that the general fund can't support. Scott suggested there be a presentation on what CIP does. Drew agrees with Scott that presentations have been helpful. Salamun said he is aware of what can go to CIP. He thinks discussion items involve debate but a presentation is informative. He said Modrick's heart is in the right place but this discussion would have been better to have between Nordstrom and Modrick. Salamun appreciates Nordstrom trying to get everyone on the same page and understands. Nordstrom said his original intent was to bring this to a working session. He appreciates the discussion and advice. Motion approved.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the committee, motion was made by Salamun, second by Scott and carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:47 a.m.