



Bismarck-Burleigh Commissions Committee

MEETING
April 7, 2026

Tom Baker Meeting Room	City/County Office Building	4:00 PM
-------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------

The Bismarck-Burleigh Commission Committee is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, April 7, 2026, at 4:00 PM in the Tom Baker Meeting Room, City/County Office Building, 221 North Fifth Street, Bismarck, North Dakota.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. [Public Comment](#)
3. Consider approval of minutes
4. Update on Provident Building Renovation Project
5. Public Health 2027 Budget Discussion
6. Burleigh County Emergency Management Building Lease Agreement
7. Other Business
8. Adjourn



MEETING OF THE BISMARCK-BURLEIGH COMMISSIONS COMMITTEE

3/3/2026 - MINUTES

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

Mayor Schmitz called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM. Those present included Bismarck City Administrator Jason Tomanek, Bismarck City Mayor Mike Schmitz, Burleigh County Auditor Mark Splonskowski, and Burleigh County Commissioner Wayne Munson.

2. [Public Comment](#)

No public comment was received.

3. Consider Approval of Minutes

Auditor Splonskowski moved to approve the minutes as presented and Administrator Tomanek seconded. Upon a roll call vote, all voted aye. M/C.

4. Missouri Valley Complex Discussion

Daniel Nairn, City Planning Director, provided a presentation on the drafted Joint Powers Agreement between the City of Bismarck and Burleigh County for the Missouri Valley Complex property owned by Burleigh County. Director Nairn explained that the purpose of the agreement is to allow Burleigh County greater flexibility and jurisdiction over development within the area while the property remains within the City of Bismarck and continues to receive City services such as police, fire, water and sewer. He stated that under the agreement, the County would assume primary responsibility for zoning, land use, permitting, road construction and maintenance, and related enforcement, while the City would retain authority over certain functions including floodplain management, aspects of stormwater regulation, and industrial pretreatment to protect the municipal sewer system. Director Nairn noted that coordination between the two entities would be required in several areas, with provisions for City concurrence to ensure compliance with engineering and infrastructure standards, particularly where County-managed improvements connect to City systems. Director Nairn closed by reviewing the provisions related to the term and termination of the agreement, stating that it would automatically renew in then year increments unless terminated.

Mayor Schmitz expressed a desire to systematically review the "powers and duties" section to ensure alignment between City and County perspectives. He emphasized the importance of identifying potential concerns from the City side before moving forward.

Mayor Schmitz asked for clarification regarding the three-party concurrence process for subdivision plats, along with concern about whether City approval of plats within City limits is legally required. Mayor Schmitz also noted that differences in fire code and building code requirements could present challenges. Mayor Schmitz supported providing the County with flexibility while ensuring proper coordination and clarity.

Commissioner Munson expressed that he was looking at the proposal from the County's perspective, expressing caution about potential added responsibilities like enforcing City building codes. Commissioner Munson stated that he is comfortable with the City maintaining control over essential services such as fire, water, sewer, and police, but is cautious about expanding obligations beyond those areas. Commissioner Munson believes that Burleigh County would have a role similar to a developer and should manage its own infrastructure, including roads and utilities.

Administrator Tomanek highlighted key legal and structural issues, including what occurs when land is sold to private owners, whether jurisdiction should automatically revert to the City, and the implications if the agreement is terminated.

Overall discussion highlighted key concerns regarding differences between City and County codes, utility and infrastructure responsibilities, jurisdictional changes tied to land ownership, and the legal structure of the agreement. There was general consensus that the County could assume greater control over the development while the City would maintain authority over essential services. Emphasis was placed on close staff coordination and legal clarity. Next steps will be to have both entities review and refine details of the agreement with legal teams, ensuring proper agreement structure, aiming for finalization and approval within the targeted March timeline.

- [JPA Draft Missouri Valley Complex](#)

5. Other Business

6. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:31 PM.