



January 16, 2025

City of Valley City
254 Second Ave NE
Valley City, ND 58072

Attn: Gwen Crawford, City Administrator

RE: Paving District No. 130
UGP-2-990(068), PCN 24181
SU-CPU-2-990(069), PCN 24239
Second Street – City of Valley City, ND

Dear Gwen,

Included with this letter are two (2) sets of original signature documents protesting Paving District No. 130. We (I am using the word “we” because several people besides myself have reviewed the data collected) believe that the signatures included represent just under fifty-three percent (53%) of the impacted property owners. We believe that collecting signatures on a common petition in letter form meets the intent of the statute which only requires a signature and description of the property. Both the legal description and property address were provided with signatures.

Please note that extent of the project was outlined by emails to myself from City representatives and project informational maps that were made public and posted on NewsDakota. Assuming that the proposed project is what was defined by the project maps (and furthermore defined by the special assessment calculations) we believe that our mathematical protest numbers are correct. In performing our review work, we have discovered several discrepancies in the data presented in spreadsheet calculations. In particular, there is a departure in lengths calculated for project impacts and assessments. We are happy to share our findings in a meeting if you believe it to be helpful.

In general, there was a consensus amongst everyone we spoke to that the ten (10) days between the informational meeting on January 6th and the petition deadline of today (January 16th) was insufficient for our questions to be answered. After James Jenson met with City Attorney Martineck, we felt that there was no option for us to ask for anything (like more time); therefore, protest signatures were gathered.

Letter to COVC

Re: Project UPG-2-990(068), PCN 24181 – Second Street

January 16, 2025

Page 2 of 2

We are well aware that grant monies are involved. We are also aware that project plans have not yet been completed. For what the scope of the project is, the planned project costs are too high (several times higher) than what is necessary or typical for such projects. We also believe that you are including items that do not need to be completed at this time that provide little to no added benefit to property owners. We also believe that many of the proposed improvements like fixing or replacing a fire hydrant or a water valve are spot repair projects that should be being repaired by city water department personnel. Those types of things are rarely included in a capital improvement project because of how much more that they will cost combined with the fact that our monthly water and sewer bills include the routine O&M work that is done by city staff.

Most importantly, we feel like the project was dropped on us without ample time to digest its impacts. Our group was not able to get in contact with everyone on the special assessment list. Only one person that we did speak with was in favor of the project and not willing to protest. Several people showed up wanting to sign the protest that we not even on the special assessment roll.

Instead of the city proposing projects that the tax-payers have to scramble and say no to in a narrow window of time, you may want to consider getting signatures of support before you start. We also feel like you should have included a “return form” with check boxes that indicated you were for, against, or wanted more information. That would have simplified the process significantly. Our group is also very concerned to see a home that has an assessed value of \$35,000 get a special assessment of \$17,000. We are opposed to that sort of drastic impact.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Cory Ravnaas', written in a cursive style.

Cory Ravnaas
President

Attachments: (As Noted)
CC: File