City of Minot

Special City Council Meeting
Thursday, September 3, 2026, at 8:30 AM
City Council Chambers, City Hall (10 3rd Ave SW)
Any person needing special accommodation for the meeting is requested to notify the City Clerk's office at 857-4752.

1. ROLL CALL

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. 2027 BUDGET INFORMATION UPDATE

4. CONSENT ITEMS - ALDERMAN BLESSUM'S RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council approve the use of the 2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time) in the amount of $1,056,011.00.

4.2. REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council approve the use of the 2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change would be required) in the amount of $1,000,000.00.

4.3. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council direct the City Manager to begin a Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) with a targeted goal of $1,265,250.00 in reductions to the general fund in the 2027 budget.

4.4. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council approve the Minot Police Department to reduce sworn staff to 75 officers.

4.5. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the PD Program Management Analyst position.

4.6. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position.

4.7. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the Administrative Business Analyst I position.

4.8. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council reduce Fire Prevention staffing to only the Fire Marshal position.

4.9. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council hold the retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation.

4.10. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the Community Development Director position.

4.11. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the Plumbing Inspector III position and transfer to ND State Plumbing Board.

4.12. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation).

4.13. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council combine the Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions.

4.14. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council consolidate the Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support positions.

4.15. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council reduce steps 1-8 salary increases from 5% to 2.5% in the 2027 Annual Pay Plan.

4.16. PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council direct staff to include an additional personnel vacancy factor in the 2027 budget in the amount of $206,500.00.

4.17. COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council include pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform in the amount of $200,000.00.

4.18. COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council increase general fund and levy supported user fee cost recovery in the amount of $200,000.00.

4.19. COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council increase general fund reimbursement from enterprise funds in the amount of $200,000.00.

4.20. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council eliminate the City Council and Mayor position salaries.

4.21. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #1:

- **Reduce 10021000-41100 Police Department - Regular Employees - FTO Stipend $46,800.00**

4.22. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #2:

- **Reduce 10021000-41100 Police Department - Regular Employees - SWAT Stipend $54,750.00**

4.23. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #3:

- **Reduce 10021000-45900 Police Department - Education and Training $10,000.00**

4.24. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #4:

- **Reduce 10024000-45800 Dispatch - Travel Costs $2,000.00**

4.25. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #5:

- **Reduce 10024000-46101 Dispatch - Office Supplies $1,000.00**

4.26. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #6:

- **Reduce 10031000-41100 Fire Department - Regular Employees $116,000.00**

4.27. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #7:

- **Reduce 10031000-41300 Fire Department - Overtime $75,000.00**

4.28. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #8:

- **Reduce 10031000-43300 Fire Department - Other Professional Services $8,000.00 (physicals only for those required)**

4.29. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #9:

- **Reduce 10031000-43300 Fire Department - Other Professional Services $5,400.00 (Cordico Wellness App)**

4.30. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #10:

- **Reduce 10031000-44320 Fire Department - Structure Repair &**

Maintenance $5,000.00 (unscheduled maintenance)

4.31. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #11:

- **Reduce 10031000-46101 FD011 Fire Department - Department Materials and Supplies $3,000.00 (apparatus equipment)**

4.32. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #12:

- **Reduce 10031000-46101 FD024 Fire Department - Department Materials & Supplies $4,000.00 (cleaning supplies)**

4.33. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #13:

- **Reduce 10031000-46105 Fire Department - Cleaning Supplies $2,500.00 (carpet cleaning)**

4.34. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #14:

- **Reduce 10044000-45800 Property Maintenance - Travel Costs $1,500.00**

4.35. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #15:

- **Reduce 10044000-45920 Property Maintenance - Wearing Apparel $1,000.00**

4.36. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #16:

- **Reduce 13057000-45900 Landfill - Education and Training $10,000.00**

4.37. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #17:

- **Reduce 10024000-43200 Dispatch - Professional Testing $2,052.00 (hearing tests)**

4.38. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #18:

- **Reduce 10035000-43900 Community Development - Memberships and Associations $1,025.00**

4.39. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #19:

- **Reduce 11050000-43050 Airport - Engineers - $15,000.00 (misc. work)**

4.40. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #20:

- **Reduce 11050000-43040 Airport - Consultants $500.00 (PFM Contract)**

4.41. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #21:

- **Reduce 13056000-43900 Garbage Collection - Memberships and Associations $950.00**

4.42. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #22:

- **Reduce 14060000-43040 Water Treatment Plant - Consultants $25,000.00**

4.43. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #23:

- **Reduce 14060000-43300 Water Treatment Plant - Other Professional Services $2,000.00**

4.44. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #24:

- **Reduce 14062000-43040 Sewage Pumping - Consultants $15,000.00**

4.45. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #25:

- **Reduce 14062000-43900 Sewage Pumping - Memberships and Associations $1,854.00**

4.46. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #26:

- **Reduce 10021000-46101 Police Department - Department Materials & Supplies - $1,300.00 (staff ID photos)**

4.47. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #27:

- **Reduce 10021000-46101 Police Department - Department Materials & Supplies $5,000.00**

4.48. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #28:

- **Reduce 10021000-46104 Police Department - Canine Care & Supplies $4,750.00 (reduce for Cyrus retirement)**

4.49. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #29:

- **Reduce 10021000-46108 Police Department - Ammunition and**

Targets $2,000.00

4.50. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #30:

- **Reduce 10021000-46114 Police Department - Crime Investigation and Buy Money $1,500.00**

4.51. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #31:

- **Reduce 10024000-46102 Dispatch - Office Equipment and Furniture $1,129.00 (standard desktop computer - not scheduled for replacement)**

4.52. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #32:

- **Reduce 10024000-46102 Dispatch - Office Equipment and Furniture $500.00 (excess funding over IT schedule of replacements)**

4.53. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #33:

- **Reduce 10031000-46102 Fire Department - Office Equipment and Furniture $5,500.00**

4.54. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #34:

- **Reduce 10031000-46105 Fire Department - Cleaning Supplies $3,720.00 (HVAC Cleaning)**

4.55. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #35:

- **Reduce 10035000-46103 LCOPY Community Development - Copier and Printer Supplies $3,000.00 (energy savings program flyers)**

4.56. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #36:

- **Reduce 10036000-46103 Building Safety - Copier and Printer Supplies $1,500.00**

4.57. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #37:

- **Reduce 10044000-46101 Property Maintenance - Department Materials & Supplies $6,630.00**

4.58. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #38:

- **Reduce 11050000-46105 Airport - Cleaning Supplies $3,500.00**

4.59. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #39:

- **Reduce 12054000-46103 Cemetery - Copier and Printer Supplies $800.00**

4.60. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement the Finance Director's identified operating cost reduction #40:

- **Reduce 10024000-41100 Dispatch - Salaries $7,800.00 (Comm Training Officer stipend)**

4.61. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council remove the new Capital Equipment levy in the amount of $350,000.00.

4.62. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council reduce the Library operating expenses in the amount of $300,000.00.

4.63. DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council implement a cap on the General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000.00 per entity.

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #1:
The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

5.2. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #2:
Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

5.3. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #3:
The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

5.4. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #4:
The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

5.5. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #5:
The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

5.6. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #6:
The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving

effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

5.7. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #7:
The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

5.8. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #8:
8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

5.9. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #9:
The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

5.10. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #10:
The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured

by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

5.11. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #11:
11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

5.12. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #12:
City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

5.13. ALDERMAN PODRYGULA'S RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council support Resolution #13:
Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

5.14. MAYOR JANTZER'S RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDED ACTION
It is recommended City Council increase the Minot Public Library book budget by $40,000.00, restoring part of the reduction presented in the

City Manager Recommended 2027 budget.

5.15. OTHER REMAINING 2027 BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION
This provides an opportunity to submit any additional recommendations for consideration in the 2027 budget.

6. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

ORG	Object	Description	Cut Amount	
10021000	41100	FTO Stipend	46,800	
10021000	41100	SWAT Stipend	54,750	
10021000	45900	Travel Costs	10,000	
10024000	45800	Travel Costs	2,000	
10024000	46101	Office Supplies	1,000	
10031000	41100	Regular Employees	116,000	
10031000	41300	Overtime	75,000	
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	8,000	Physicals only for those required
10031000	43300	Other Professional Services	5,400	Cordico Wellness App
10031000	44320	Structure Rpr & Mtc	5,000	Unscheduled Maintenance
10031000	46101	FD011 Dept Materials	3,000	Apparatus equipment
10031000	46101	FD024 Dept. Materials	4,000	Office Supplies
10031000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	2,500	Carpet Cleaning
10044000	45800	Travel Costs	1,500	
10044000	45930	Wearing Apparel	1,000	
13057000	45900	Education and Training	10,000	Description shows $1,000 but entered as $11,000
10024000	43200	Professional Testing	2,052	Hearing Tests - NEW in 2027
10035000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,025	Removes anything other than APA/AICP, EDND, NDPA, ISCS
11050000	43050	Engineers	15,000	Misc. Work?
11050000	43040	Consultants	500	PFM Contract?
13056000	43900	Memberships and Associations	950	Removed anything other than ND Solid Waste and Recycling for $325/annually
14060000	43040	Consultants	25,000	No justification or description
14060000	43300	Other Professional Services	2,000	Significant increase planned in 2027? No justification explaining why
14062000	43040	Consultants	15,000	Historically spent less - why do we need $20K in "general wastewater consulting"?
14062000	43900	Memberships and Associations	1,854	Looks like this may be a duplicate entry; references "2026 Preliminary Budget plus 3% increase"
10021000	46101	Staff ID Photos	1,300	PIO office has a camera?
10021000	46101	Department supplies	5,000	No justification or description
10021000	46104	Canine	4,750	Reduce for Cyrus retirement
10021000	46108	Ammunition and Targets	2,000	Historically spent less
10021000	46114	Crime Investigation and Buy Money	1,500	Historically spent less
10024000	46102	Standard Desktop Computer	1,129	Not included in IT's schedule of replacements
10025000	46102	Computer Replacements	500	Excess above IT's schedule of replacements
10031000	46102	Station Furniture/Appliances	5,500	Cut in half
10031000	46105	HVAC Cleaning	3,720	Can PM staff do this?
10035000	46103	LCOPY Print Energy Savings Program Flyers	3,000	Is this a requirement?
10036000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	1,500	Historically spent less
10044000	46101	Department supplies	6,630	Historically spent less
11050000	46105	Cleaning Supplies	3,500	Historically spent less
12054000	46103	Copier and Printer Supplies	800	Historically spent less
10024000	41100	Comm Training Officer Stipend	7,800	

Total	457,960

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Reference document prepared by Alderman Mike Blessum - August 31, 2026.

Background and Methodology

The 2027 city manager proposed budget increases the citywide property tax levy from $20,100,754 to $26,757,445, a $6,656,691 increase. Adding $211,144 in new growth capacity to the 2026 levy produces a growth adjusted target of $20,311,898; the proposed levy exceeds that target by $6,445,547. This document identifies $7,929,250 in adjustments across four categories: redirecting sales tax and economic development revenue to property tax relief, reducing personnel costs through attrition, voluntary separation, and position eliminations, recovering more service cost from users and increasing General Fund reimbursement from enterprise funds, and reducing discretionary operating spending.

These items were evaluated against the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget, city financial workbooks, the employee roster, and, where noted, external sources. If every item is realized with no overlap, the resulting levy is approximately $18,828,195. Because some personnel items may overlap (a VSIP departure, retirement, vacancy, and named elimination can describe the same position), a planning range of $19,328,195–$19,828,195 assumes $500,000–$1,000,000 of nonadditive overlap.

Levy Target at a Glance

Measure	Amount
2026 Citywide property tax levy	$20,100,754
Estimated levy capacity from new properties	+$211,144
Growth adjusted 2027 levy target	$20,311,898
2027 proposed Citywide levy	$26,757,445
Amount proposed levy exceeds growth adjusted target	$6,445,547
Gross adjustments identified in this document	$7,929,250
Illustrative levy after all gross adjustments*	**$18,828,195**
Planning range assuming $500K–$1.0M of overlap**	**$19,328,195–$19,828,195**

**Illustrative: assumes every item below is realized with no overlap.*

***Planning range reflecting the likelihood that some personnel items (VSIP, vacancies, retirements, and named position eliminations) are not fully additive.*

Summary of Proposed Adjustments

CATEGORY 1: REDIRECT SALES TAX ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE		
1.1	2026 economic development sales tax allocation (one time)	$1,056,011
1.2	2027 economic development sales tax allocation (potentially recurring, policy/ordinance change required)	$1,000,000
	CATEGORY 1 TOTAL	**$2,056,011**

CATEGORY 2: PERSONNEL COST REDUCTIONS		
2.1	Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP)	$1,265,250
2.2	Reduce Police sworn staffing to 75	$753,768
2.3	Eliminate PD Program Management Analyst position	$79,432
	Eliminate Fire Public Safety Business Analyst position	$122,112
	Eliminate Administrative Business Analyst I position	$86,517
2.4	Reduce Fire Prevention staffing to Fire Marshal	$193,059
2.5	Hold retiring Assessor position vacant pending evaluation	$214,683
2.6	Eliminate Community Development Director position	$182,037
	Eliminate Plumbing Inspector III position (transfer to ND State Plumbing Board)	$116,627
	Eliminate Mechanical Inspector III position (combination inspector consolidation)	$118,942
	Combine Residential and Commercial Plan Reviewer positions	$92,417
	Consolidate Engineering/Inspections/Planning administrative support	$95,167
2.7	Reduce steps 1–8 increases from 5% to 2.5%	$240,000
2.8	Additional personnel vacancy factor	$206,500
	CATEGORY 2 TOTAL	**$3,766,511**

CATEGORY 3: COST RECOVERY AND GENERAL FUND REIMBURSEMENTS		
3.1	Pound licensing, impound, and related fee reform	$200,000
3.2	Increase GF and levy supported user fee cost recovery	$200,000
3.3	Increase GF reimbursement from enterprise funds	$200,000
	CATEGORY 3 TOTAL	**$600,000**

CATEGORY 4: DISCRETIONARY OPERATING SPENDING REDUCTIONS		
4.1	Eliminate City Council and Mayor salaries	$111,612
4.2	Finance Director's identified operating cost reductions	$403,156
4.3	Remove new Capital Equipment levy	$350,000
4.4	Library operating savings target	$300,000
4.5	Cap GF community contributions at $250,000 per entity	$341,960
	CATEGORY 4 TOTAL	**$1,506,728**

	TOTAL GROSS IDENTIFIED ADJUSTMENTS	**$7,929,250**

Category 1: Redirect Sales Tax Economic Development Revenue $2,056,011

The city collects sales tax revenue earmarked for economic development. The following items would redirect a portion of that revenue toward property tax relief without changing any tax rate.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal

The MAGIC Fund is the city's sales tax supported economic development fund, projected at $2,189,428 in the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget. The table below shows the fund as adjusted for the 2027 Economic Development Allocation item detailed below. That item redirects $1,000,000 of this fund to property tax relief, shown here as a new Property Tax Relief line replacing the Primary Sector and State Program Matching Funds lines ($208,928 and $750,000, totaling $958,928). Flood Protection Maintenance absorbs the $41,072 remaining balance of that redirection, falling from $347,905 to $306,833, so the fund total ties to the original $2,189,428 rather than growing. These allocations are dependent on council approval of amendments to the sales tax allocation ordinance.

MAGIC Fund: As Adjusted Under This Proposal	Amount
Auditors	$12,000
Minot Area Chamber EDC (MACEDC)	$669,650
Souris Basin Planning Council	$20,000
General Fund Administration	$75,000
Data Gathering	$105,945
ADMINISTRATION TOTAL	**$882,595**
PROPERTY TAX RELIEF	**$1,000,000**
FLOOD PROTECTION MAINTENANCE	**$306,833**
TOTAL	**$2,189,428**

1.1 2026 Economic Development Allocation — $1,056,011

Amending the sales tax allocation ordinance would allow approximately $1,056,011 tied to the prior allocation period to be applied to 2027 property tax relief. This is a one time, nonrecurring resource and should not be assumed to recur in 2028 and later years.

1.2 2027 Economic Development Allocation — $1,000,000

The same ordinance amendment will allow the council to redirect $1,000,000 of 2027 economic development sales tax collections to property tax relief. Allocations 2028 and after are contingent on continued annual appropriation and stable sales tax collections.

Category 2: Personnel Cost Reductions $3,766,511

This category combines several mechanisms: attrition and voluntary separation (VSIP), holding vacant positions unfilled pending review, and outright elimination of specific positions. Some items depend on natural turnover and would not require a layoff; others target currently filled positions and would require a layoff or reassignment unless timed to a retirement or vacancy. Each item below specifies which mechanism applies.

Benefit Load Assumption Used in This Category

Several items in this category use a fully loaded cost per position built from an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a benefit load. The benefit load used is 47.5%. This figure is derived from the 2027 Proposed Annual Budget's own department level salary and benefits data across the 19 General Fund, levy supported departments (City Council, City Manager, Human Resources, City Attorney, Finance, Information Technology, Assessor, Police, Dispatch, Municipal Judge, Fire Control, Community Development, Inspection, Traffic, Engineering, Shop, Street, Property Maintenance, and Cemetery). Department level benefit loads in this data range from 19.1% (City Manager) to 61.2% (Information Technology); the salary weighted average across all 19 departments is 47.5%, and the unweighted average is 40.0%. At a $70,000 average salary, a 47.5% benefit load produces a fully loaded cost of $103,250 per position.

2.1 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) $1,265,250 in 2027, $1,755,250 Ongoing

This estimate is scoped to General Fund, levy supported positions, approximately 316 of the city's approximately 480 total employees, in departments funded by the property tax: police, fire, streets, engineering, finance, and similar core functions. The remaining workforce is in enterprise operations (Water, Sewer, Landfill, Airport) or partially levy supported departments (Library, Transit), approximately 165 additional employees. Any VSIP participation from those areas produces savings in utility rates or fund balances rather than the property tax levy and is not counted in this estimate.

The estimate assumes 28 levy supported employees participate in a voluntary separation offer: 14 positions eliminated outright, 14 refilled at a lower step or classification. Using an illustrative $70,000 average salary plus a 47.5% benefit load, eliminating 14 positions saves approximately $1,445,500 annually. Refilling 14 positions at approximately $55,000 instead of $70,000 saves an additional $309,750. Subtracting approximately $490,000 in one time separation payments (three months of average salary for 28 participants) produces 2027 net savings of approximately $1,265,250, rising to approximately $1,755,250 in subsequent years once the one time cost is no longer incurred.

2.2 Reduce Sworn Police Staffing to 75 $753,768

The 2027 budget authorizes 85 sworn police positions. This item sets a target of 75 sworn positions. A regional comparison was constructed using Police Scorecard's federal LEOKA based staffing data across seventeen mid sized cities (population 30,000 and above) in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska. Results are shown below, sorted from the highest to the lowest officers per 1,000 residents ratio, with the four Minot staffing scenarios highlighted to show where each would rank.

City	Sworn Officers	Population	Officers per 1,000
West Fargo, ND	79	41,175	1.92
Rapid City, SD	150	80,589	1.86
Minot, ND (authorized)	**85**	**47,308**	**1.80**
Minot, ND (funded)	**82**	**47,308**	**1.73**
Kearney, NE	60	34,782	1.73
Bismarck, ND	133	77,963	1.71
Cheyenne, WY	112	66,507	1.68
Minot, ND (staffed)	**78**	**47,308**	**1.65**
Gillette, WY	54	34,024	1.59
Minot, ND (proposed)	**75**	**47,308**	**1.59**
Grand Island, NE	85	53,943	1.58
Casper, WY	91	58,771	1.55
Grand Forks, ND	89	60,365	1.47
Laramie, WY	47	32,284	1.46
Helena, MT	51	35,138	1.45
Missoula, MT	114	78,903	1.44
Great Falls, MT	85	60,208	1.41
Billings, MT	168	121,239	1.39
Fargo, ND	185	136,275	1.36
Sioux Falls, SD	284	213,748	1.33
Bozeman, MT	66	58,814	1.12

Across the seventeen peer cities, officers per 1,000 residents range from 1.12 (Bozeman) to 1.92 (West Fargo), with a regional average of approximately 1.53 and a median of approximately 1.47. A target of 75 officers for Minot produces a rate of 1.59 per 1,000, ranking above both the regional average and median, though below the three higher Minot scenarios shown. This comparison indicates the proposed target is within normal regional practice; it does not establish that 75 is the correct number for Minot specifically, which should be modeled against Minot's own calls for service, shift minimums, and overtime exposure.

2.3 Eliminate Three Administrative Analyst Positions $288,061 Combined

Three analyst positions added since 2020 would be eliminated, with duties absorbed into existing command, Finance, IT, or centralized administrative staff: Police Program Management Analyst ($79,432), Fire Public Safety Business Analyst ($122,112), and Administrative Business Analyst I ($86,517). These positions were added to the organizational chart after 2020 and are not longstanding core functions.

2.4 Consolidate Fire Prevention Around a Single Fire Marshal $193,059

This item funds one dedicated Fire Marshal position and directs the Fire Department to implement a risk based prevention model built around that position. A regional comparison was constructed using the same set of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, and Nebraska cities used for the police staffing comparison, to identify genuinely dedicated fire prevention personnel from firefighters or suppression ranked staff who take on inspection duties as a secondary assignment.

City	Dedicated Fire Prevention / Fire Marshal Staffing	Confidence
Minot, ND (proposed)	**1 Fire Marshal, risk based model**	**This proposal**
Billings, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 4 Deputy Fire Marshals (6 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Missoula, MT	Fire Marshal + Assistant Fire Marshal + 3 Fire Inspectors (5 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Great Falls, MT	Fire Marshal + 3 Deputy Fire Marshals (4 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Grand Forks, ND	Fire Marshal + 2 Deputy Fire Marshals (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Grand Island, NE	Fire Prevention Division Chief + 2 Life Safety Inspectors (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (budget)
Helena, MT	Fire Marshal + Deputy Fire Marshal + Fire Inspector (3 dedicated)	Confirmed (official source)
Fargo, ND	Budget confirms 2 Fire Inspectors + 1 Assistant Fire Marshal added 2016–22; department claims 6 total, not itemized by title	Partially confirmed
West Fargo, ND	1 dedicated Fire Marshal confirmed; further team size not published	Partially confirmed
Bismarck, ND	1 Fire Marshal, no separate dedicated inspectors	Confirmed
Cheyenne, WY	1 Battalion Chief + 1 Fire Safety Technician dedicated per budget; 4 more budgeted as "Lieutenant," a rank also used in suppression	Likely partly cross trained
Casper, WY	~4 person Community Risk Reduction Division (down from 8 in 2015); only 1 role's dedication confirmed	Partially confirmed

Bozeman, MT	Deputy Fire Chief also serves as Fire Marshal (dual role); inspector/plans examiner count not published	Partially confirmed
Sioux Falls, SD	1 named Fire Marshal; inspection bureau size not published	Partially confirmed
Gillette, WY	1 named Fire Marshal, a distinct job classification (Campbell County Fire Dept.); team size not published	Partially confirmed
Rapid City, SD	No confirmed dedicated Fire Marshal; prevention duties mostly assigned to suppression ranked Lieutenants/Captains	Likely cross trained
Kearney, NE	No dedicated fire prevention position found; inspections handled by a separate, generalist Building Official	Confirmed (none dedicated)
Laramie, WY	Not published in a form that could be verified	Not found

Regional practice on dedicated fire prevention staffing, once cross trained and dual role positions are set aside, spans from zero confirmed dedicated positions (Kearney) to six (Billings), with budget confirmed counts of three to five dedicated positions the most common pattern among cities that publish this detail. A single dedicated Fire Marshal, as proposed here, sits at the lower end of that confirmed range but is not unprecedented; Bismarck currently operates exactly this model. Implementation of this item requires a service redesign plan addressing: routine lower risk inspections shifting to trained suppression crews, risk based inspection prioritization, and potential use of third party compliance tools, while the Fire Marshal retains plan review, investigations, and high risk enforcement.

2.5 Hold the Retiring Assessor Position Vacant Pending Review $214,683

Upon the anticipated retirement in the Assessor's Office, this item holds the position vacant and unfunded while the city evaluates whether CAMA systems, GIS, and workflow automation allow required assessment services to be maintained with one fewer position. Refilling the position would require a documented workload justification rather than automatic backfill.

2.6 Consolidate Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections $605,190

This item names five specific positions across Engineering, Community Development, and Inspections. The Community Development Director position is the largest single component. Current reporting line data shows this position directly supervises the Building Official (who manages the nine person Inspections division) and the Principal Planner (who manages the remainder of the Planning division), and reports directly to the City Manager as an independent department head position. Consolidating this oversight under City Engineer eliminates one department head position, valued at approximately $182,037. The position's economic development duties (TIF and abatement tracking, MAGIC Fund committee support, façade program administration, and coordination with MACEDC) would require reassignment.

Two Inspections positions are proposed for elimination using an existing precedent. Minot currently has no city electrical inspector position; state law and the ND State Electrical Board's published materials place Minot under the state's District 8 inspector rather than a municipal inspection program. Among the cities reviewed, only Bismarck, Fargo, and Grand Forks maintain their own electrical inspection staff. Plumbing inspection operates under a comparable statutory framework: North Dakota Century Code permits, but does not require, cities to operate their own plumbing inspection program, and the State Plumbing Board maintains licensed district inspectors as the default. Applying the same

arrangement already used for electrical inspection, the Plumbing Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) would be eliminated and the inspection function transferred to the state board, for an estimated $116,627.

No equivalent state inspection board exists for mechanical inspections. Bismarck's published Building Inspections staff directory shows an alternative model: six generalist "Building Inspector" positions with no separate plumbing or mechanical specialist titles, indicating cross trained staff covering multiple trades under combined ICC "combination inspector" certifications, a recognized credential track. Applying the same cross training approach to Minot's remaining Building Inspector positions would allow the standalone Mechanical Inspector III position (grade 65, $76,924 at mid step) to be eliminated, for an estimated $118,942.

Two additional positions are included. Inspections currently operates separate Residential Plan Reviewer (grade 53, $57,197 mid step) and Commercial Plan Reviewer (grade 58, $64,713 mid step) positions. Applying combination certification logic, cross training the Commercial Plan Reviewer to handle both residential and commercial plan review and eliminating the standalone Residential Plan Reviewer position saves an estimated $92,417.

Engineering, Inspections, and Planning each currently maintain a separate front line administrative or clerical support position: Engineering's Office and Administrative Specialist, Senior (grade 56); Inspections' Administrative Clerk, Senior (grade 49); and Planning's Planning and Code Enforcement Assistant (grade 49, which includes code enforcement duties beyond clerical work). Consolidated under one division, two positions can cover the combined front counter, permit intake, and records function. Eliminating the Inspections Administrative Clerk, Senior position (the more purely clerical of the two grade 49 roles, since the Planning position's code enforcement duties would need to be retained) saves an estimated $95,167.

2.7 Reduce Pay Steps 1–8 Increases from 5% to 2.5% $240,000

This item reduces the proposed annual step increase for employees in pay plan Steps 1 through 8 from 5% to 2.5% for 2027. Employees continue to progress through the pay plan; the item reduces the rate of payroll cost growth for 2027.

2.8 Additional Personnel Vacancy Factor $206,500

This $206,500 planning credit is in addition to, and does not duplicate, the vacancy factor already built into the City Manager's recommended budget (which budgets vacant positions at step 1 with a single health plan, per Finance). This item separately assumes the equivalent of two additional positions vacant, on average, throughout the year, beyond that existing budgeted assumption. At a $70,000 average salary plus the 47.5% benefit load described above, this produces the $206,500 planning credit.

Category 3: Cost Recovery and General Fund Reimbursements $600,000

3.1 Pound, Licensing, and Impound Fee Reform $200,000

This item redesigns animal licensing and pound service charges to shift a greater share of cost to animal owners, through higher annual license fees and increased charges for unlicensed impounds. The final figure requires verification against actual impound volumes and collection history.

3.2 Broader Cost Recovery Review $200,000

This item directs staff to review the full rates and fees schedule and identify at least $200,000 in additional cost recovery from services currently subsidized by property tax, including building permits and plan review, private development engineering review, right of way permits, reinspection, police special services, repeat false alarms, and cemetery services. The objective is aligning fees charged with the cost of providing these services to the individuals who use them. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the incremental fee increases already assumed in the City Manager's recommended budget.

3.3 General Fund Reimbursement from Enterprise Funds $200,000

The proposed budget includes approximately $3,700,000 in General Fund reimbursements from enterprise and other city operations for centralized services (City management, Finance, HR, IT, Legal, payroll, purchasing, and communications). This item directs Finance to identify at least $200,000 in additional General Fund reimbursement from the enterprise funds (Water, Sewer, Landfill, and the Airport) for centralized services those funds already receive. This $200,000 target is intended as incremental to, and separate from, the $630,034 General Fund reimbursement increase already reflected in the City Manager's recommended budget.

Category 4: Discretionary Operating Spending Reductions $1,506,728

4.1 Eliminate City Council and Mayor Salaries $111,612

This item removes the budgeted Council salary line, subject to confirmation of the legal mechanics required to do so.

4.2 Finance Director's Identified Operating Cost Reductions $403,156

The Finance Director and his team have identified cost reductions across the levy supported departments for items such as consultants and professional services, travel/training/advertising/memberships, and contracts and service level agreements.

4.3 Remove the New Capital Equipment Levy $350,000

This item removes the proposed new $350,000 property tax levy for capital equipment, requiring the program to be funded from existing resources or through deferred purchases.

4.4 Set a Library Operating Savings Target $300,000

This item reduces the Library appropriation by $300,000, with implementation (hours, staffing, programming, or acquisitions) determined by the Library Board.

4.5 Cap General Fund Community Contributions at $250,000 per Entity $341,960

This item caps recurring General Fund contributions to any single outside organization at $250,000 unless Council approves a specific exception.

CITY OF MINOT CITY COUNCIL

Motion Regarding the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal

Consent Agenda Procedure

Moved by Alderman Blessum:

I move that the Council take up the 2027 Budget Adjustment Proposal (the "Package"), dated August 31, 2026, consisting of the eighteen numbered items summarized in Categories 1 through 4 of that document, totaling $7,929,250 in gross identified adjustments, under the following procedure, modeled on the Council's consent agenda practice:

1. Presentation as a Package. All eighteen items (1.1 through 4.5) are brought before the Council together, as a single package, for consideration and action.
2. Right to Pull an Item. Before any vote is taken on the Package, any Council member may request that any individual numbered item be pulled from the Package for separate discussion and a separate vote. A request to pull an item requires no second and shall be granted as a matter of course. The Chair shall call for such requests and shall confirm, for the record, the complete list of items pulled, if any, before proceeding to a vote.
3. First Vote — Remaining Items. Once all items to be pulled have been identified, the Chair shall call for a single motion and vote adopting all items in the Package that have not been pulled, as and for a single consolidated action of the Council.
4. Second Stage — Pulled Items. Each item that was pulled under paragraph 2 shall then be taken up individually, in numerical order, for separate discussion and a separate, individual vote for ratification. A pulled item may be adopted, amended, rejected, or tabled by the Council on its own terms, without affecting the validity of the vote taken on the remaining, non-pulled items under paragraph 3.
5. Effect of Adoption. Adoption of an item — whether as part of the consolidated vote under paragraph 3 or as an individually ratified item under paragraph 4 — directs staff to incorporate that item into the 2027 budget revision process to the extent, and subject to the further review, confirmation, and implementation steps, described for that item in the Package.
6. No Effect on Individual Item Terms. Nothing in this procedure alters the substance, dollar amount, or conditions of any individual item as set out in the Package; it governs only the manner and sequence in which the Council votes on the items.

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

Memo

To: Hon. Mayor and fellow Aldermen
From: Steve Podrygula, Council President
Subject: Items to consider at special Council budget meeting (on 9/3)
Date: August 27, 2026

Regardless of what specific adjustments we might choose to make regarding the proposed budget for 2027, I want to bring up some underlying issues that I believe we need to consider.

These ideas are based upon my listening to members of the public and the Council, reflection on our discussions and debates, and my desire to try to arrive at a shared understanding of the broader picture, hopefully, facilitating a consensus.

I will divide up specific suggestions and proposed resolutions into the following categories: leadership and priorities, improving management, fiscal responsibility and revenue generation, and being honest and transparent with our citizens.

Leadership and priorities

Before we can reach a consensus on a proposed budget, I strongly believe we need to have a better sense of what our priorities are as a city government, and what goals we are attempting to reach.

Resolution #1. The mayor, city manager and Council leadership shall plan and schedule a Council retreat, for early this fall, to allow adequate time for consideration and discussion of city priorities.

Resolution #2. Based on the results of the retreat meeting, the mayor and Council will jointly develop, with the city manager, priorities for him to work toward (and ways of budgeting his time and efforts). The city manager is asked to inform the Council when requested or assigned tasks, for him or employees, start to exceed available resources and capabilities.

Improved management

Resolution #3. The Council asks the city manager to develop and articulate a coherent management model and process (e.g., PII, management by objectives, or whatever), for the Council to fully understand and support its implementation.

Resolution #4. The Council asks the city manager to ensure that each department develops and implements specific goals and objectives, in a manner allowing comparability between departments and congruence with city-wide goals. To the extent feasible, objectives should be measurable, and employee and departmental performance judged on outcomes (not inputs). In the future, budget allocations should be based on outcomes and performance.

Resolution #5. The Council asks the city manager to develop a plan to achieve greater integration of departmental personnel, services, and activities (to overcome the tendency to operate within individual “silos”).

Resolution #6. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study the potential development of a performance-based compensation system for employees. This should include mechanisms for soliciting, and rewarding, citizen and employee suggestions for improving effectiveness and efficiency of city services.

Resolution #7. The Council asks the city manager and human resources director to study staff turnover, identify likely causes, and develop a plan to address those causes and decrease turnover.

My belief is that our current level of staff turnover, about 20% annually, is excessive, costly, and has a significant negative impact on operational effectiveness and efficiency. I would like to see this be reduced, perhaps to about 10%, or at least consistent with industry/government "best practices".

Resolution #8.

8.1. The city manager and human resources director are asked to develop and articulate a coherent strategy to improve effectiveness and efficiency by empowering staff and ensuring they have the adequate resources to do the job that is asked of them. Specific components should include assuring adequate initial training, improving the skills of new first-line managers/supervisors (from the outset), providing adequate ongoing leadership training for all supervisors, assessing the desirability of focused customer service training (at least for "customer – facing" staff), and improving inter-departmental cooperation.

8.2. Current efforts to systematically measure employee engagement, and to provide ongoing leadership training are encouraged and should be augmented as necessary.

Resolution #9. The mayor is asked to appoint a committee to systematically review city operations and positions, congruent with established goals, with the aim of achieving maximal effectiveness and efficiency. The membership of this committee should be broad-based, including city staff, members of the Council, and citizens with relevant experience and expertise.

The intent is that this be an in-depth process, with adequate time (likely measured in months) allowing careful consideration of the issues. Models would be the federal government's Grace Commission (established in 1982 by Pres. Reagan) and our own current development/zoning code review process.

<u>Fiscal responsibility and revenue generation</u>

Resolution #10. The determination of municipal fees and charges should be based upon the actual cost of delivering these services (to the extent feasible), plus reasonable administrative or "overhead" costs. These costs should be adjusted annually, to track actual cost of living changes (as measured by the consumer price index). If, for some reason, city administration chooses not to make the cost of living adjustment, they must provide a written justification for this to the Council.

Resolution #11.

11.1. Realistically, the Council understands that each yearly budget will reflect changes in the cost of living, especially inflation.

11.2. The Council directs staff to prepare a realistic yearly budget, identifying both the advantages and disadvantages of recommended expenditures, and not merely trying to achieve some arbitrary goal (e.g., in terms of revenue generation, mill levy, etc.).

Resolution #12. City staff is asked to identify potential revenue generation methods, to lessen dependence on property taxes and do what is possible to keep them limited. Specifically, staff is asked to examine the possibility of a dedicated sales tax for public safety, or perhaps one for public works. Creative alternatives (e.g., franchise fees) also should be considered.

Resolution #13. Because of the enormous costs of NAWS and flood protection, which dramatically reduce our options in terms of expense reductions and revenue generation, we ask city administration to lobby more strongly, in Congress and the state Legislature, for increased funding for these projects (which benefit the entire region, not just the city). We should explore dedicated funding from the Department of Defense, because of the key role of Minot Air Force Base in national defense (e.g., making sure that personnel can travel to the Base and carry out their operational duties). The Sentinel project will place additional demands on our roads and utilities, which need to be protected from flooding.

Honesty and transparency

My own belief is that, historically, the Council has been reluctant to consider budgets that fully reflect staff recommendations (as to what resources they need to deliver the services that citizens expect and ask for). There is a strong tendency to "kick the can down the road", particularly in terms of infrastructure and maintenance; for example, we have over $225 million in infrastructure needs (that have accumulated over years, often because of deferred maintenance) and anticipated capital improvement needs of over $950 million. As the Council has previously recognized, drawing upon reserves has limits, and we cannot continue to do so indefinitely.

Although I strongly believe we need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of city government, I also think that we need to be honest and transparent with citizens about what it costs to deliver services.

City government is often encouraged to operate more like a private business. Although businesses try to be more efficient, there is no business that can accommodate steadily increasing costs without raising prices or revenues. We also need to keep in mind a significant difference in fundamental goals for these different kinds of organizations: generally, the aim of a business is to increase profits (for owners and shareholders), while the goal of government is to improve services (to the public).

I also feel we have become overly focused on property taxes, and need to look at the entire financial burden placed on citizens. In terms of that overall cost, the finance department points out that even the proposed city budget would still leave us with the lowest overall tax burden (per capita) of the six largest cities in the state. As for supposedly being a "high tax" state, North Dakota actually ranks 43rd in overall tax burden.

To be intellectually honest, I think we need to distinguish between "is" and "ought" (borrowing from Hume's distinction). While we may certainly want taxes to be lower (the "ought" point of view), the reality "is" that they are quite low (comparatively speaking). Facts are different from beliefs and

preferences. We also need to acknowledge that there are disadvantages to limiting budgets and taxes, not just benefits.

Although the proposed total property tax collection is 32% higher than in 2026, the overall city budget has increased only 8/10 of 1%, far less than inflation, which has been hovering around the 3.5% mark. I am skeptical that we can maintain needed city services if we can't even keep pace with inflation.

While I certainly appreciate public concern with property taxes, it is important to remember that the City of Minot receives only 30% of the overall property tax dollar (with the public schools obtaining the largest share, 42%, and the county 18%). Obviously, a third increase in the City's share of the property tax dollar does not mean a 30% increase in the overall bill a citizen would pay.

Similarly, the supposed distinction between "wants" and "needs" is difficult to determine. How do we objectively distinguish between one and the other? To me, it's more a matter of priorities, and where our proposed expenditures lie on a dimension (rather than one or the other of these two arbitrary and ill-defined categories)

As for the "fraud, waste, and abuse" that some believe they see, my sense is that the issue is really one of differing priorities and underlying values (e.g., a high level of city services versus keeping taxes low). I have yet to see rampant waste; most requests for funding that we receive, from city staff and outside parties, seem reasonable (and few are outlandish or unjustified). The issue becomes one of deciding between a large number of decent options, and balancing competing (and sometimes conflicting) interests.

In examining the budget, I think we need be aware of the larger context. For example, Minot's cost of living is 9.6% lower than the national average; compared to other large North Dakota cities, it is essentially the same as Grand Forks, only 3.2% higher than Bismarck, and 4.9% less than Fargo, so moving to a comparable metropolitan area generally wouldn't be cheaper in that respect (and while moving to a small community would be cheaper, fewer urban amenities would be available). There really is some truth to the adage that "you get what you pay for".

And most of those on an arguably "fixed income" – Social Security recipients, such as me – are expecting a cost-of-living benefit increase of 3.8% next year. To expect the city to absorb significant cost increases, without addressing both the revenue and expenditures aspects of our budget, strikes me as unrealistic.

To me, increasing effectiveness and efficiency are both essential, and most of my proposed resolutions are directed toward that goal.

Personally, I would prioritize public safety, and then focus on core city services (such as roads, water mains, sewer lines, etc.). However, we also need to remember other services, such as the library, that add to our overall quality of life.

As US Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes Junior stated (in a 1927 Supreme Court opinion): "taxes are what we pay for civilized society".

SP/d
08/27/26

City of Minot

TO: Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Mark Jantzer, City Council Member

DATE: September 3, 2026

SUBJECT: MAYOR JANTZER'S RECOMMENDATION

I. RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended City Council increase the Minot Public Library book budget by $40,000.00, restoring part of the reduction presented in the City Manager Recommended 2027 budget.

II. DEPARTMENT CONTACT PERSONS

III. DESCRIPTION

A. Background

Place information here about the issues/project and why it is important that we address them. Make it brief but informative. You can add additional sections to this area such as:

B. Proposed Project

Place information about the proposed project and what the goals and objectives of the project are. Why is it important to do this project? What does the project get or do for us?

C. Recommendation Detail

State how you went about identifying the recommended action for City Council. Discuss with council if the selection, bidding, or purchasing process. Inform City Council of the time constraints.

IV. IMPACT

A. Service/Delivery Impact:

State how this project will impact (improve, augment, advance) the City, your Department, our services, quality, delivery, customer experience, etc.

B. Fiscal Impact

Briefly state how this project is being funded. Add written context in the paragraph so the dollar amounts, sources of funding, and expenses are

made clear and document whether the project was included in the approved budget.

Project Costs

List the cost components and dollar amounts

Project Funding

Place the name of the account or line item

VI. ALTERNATIVES

State the alternatives to this project. The alternatives need to be viable options and there should be at least two: one would be some other approach and what the results of that alternative would be and the second would be not to do the project and what the result would be.