

# City of Minot



**TO:** Mayor Shaun Sipma  
Members of the City Council

**FROM:** Alderman Podrygula

**DATE:** 08/15/2019

**SUBJECT: CITY HALL RETAINING WALL**

## I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

To receive and discuss new and additional information regarding the City Hall retaining wall and decide whether to reconsider the action taken at the August 5 Council meeting, under agenda item 8.8.

## II. DEPARTMENT CONTACT PERSONS

Alderman Stephan Podrygula

839-7473

## III. DESCRIPTION

### A. Background

Following discussion of the City Hall wall retaining project at the Council's regular meeting of August 5, Alderman Podrygula had some further questions regarding the matter, and ended up having a (31-minute-long) telephone conversation with the consulting structural engineer – Cassie McNames, PE, from KLJ – who originally presented at the Council meeting.

Alderman Podrygula felt the information he obtained was significant and should be made available to the Council and the public.

## IV. IMPACT:

### A. Strategic Impact:

Consideration of this information should help the Council make more appropriate decisions regarding a major capital improvements project, and help the public better understand the issues and the rationale for those decisions.

### B. Service/Delivery Impact:

Clear direction from the Council should help staff deliver services in a more appropriate manner.

### C. Fiscal impact:

There is no impact from consideration and discussion of this information. Should the Council decide to formally reconsider its previous action, and then decide on another course of action, there might be fiscal impact (either positive or negative).

## **V. ALTERNATIVES**

Alt 1. The Council could choose to consider the additional information, which should increase its confidence in the previously made decision and help the public better understand the rationale for the choice of option 5A/4A in terms of dealing with the problems with the retaining wall.

Alt 2. The Council could choose to formally reconsider its previous decision. If a motion to reconsider were made and approved, the whole issue would be opened up again.

## **VI. TIME CONSTRAINTS**

Based on the new information, if the Council wanted to reconsider its decision (of August 5), a formal parliamentary motion to reconsider would have to be made at this meeting.

If Alternative 2 were chosen, the entire project could be delayed, depending upon which further action the Council might decide on (e.g., asking for a formal engineering study of a steep grass slope alternative).

## **VII. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

Attached is a memo from Alderman Podrygula, dated 08/13/2009, about the issue, in particular, presenting information obtained from the structural engineer.