| Project Title | 2008 Agency Priority | Agency (\$ by Session) | | | | | Governor's Governor's Recommendations Planning 2008 Estimate | |
|--|----------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|---------|-----|--|------|
| | Ranking | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | Total | | 2010 | 2012 |
| Albert Lea: Edgewater Park (Former Dump) | ALB-1 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Alden-Conger Schools: Alden Community Ctr | ALS-1 | 950 | 0 | 0 | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Annandale: Annandale Tactical Training Ctr | ANN-1 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anoka County: Rice Creek No. Regional Trail Connect | ANO-1 | 2,334 | 0 | 0 | 2,334 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Anoka-Sherburne-Wright : Regional Crime Lab | ANS-1 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arden Hills: TH 10/CR 96, CR H/I-35W interchngs | ARD-1 | 29,000 | 0 | 0 | 29,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Aurora: Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase II | AUR-1 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Austin: Austin Area Success Center | AUS-1 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Babbitt: City Garage Replacement | BAB-1 | 310 | 0 | 0 | 310 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Barnum: Municipal Supply Well & control system | BAR-1 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Baudette: Water Towers | BAU-1 | 425 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bemidji: Bemidji Regional Event Center (BREC) | BEM-1 | 22,000 | 0 | 0 | 22,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Benson: East Pacific Avenue Improvements | BEN-1 | 725 | 0 | 0 | 725 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Big Lake Sanitary Distr: Wastewater Improvements | BGL-1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blooming Prairie: 3rd St Sanitary & Storm Sewers | BMP-1 | 1,021 | 0 | 0 | 1,021 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bloomington: Mall of America Phase II | BMT-1 | 192,185 | 0 | 0 | 192,185 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Brainerd: Downtown Street & Utility Infrastructure | BRN-1 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buckman: Tornado siren, pump house, park improvements | BUC-1 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burnsville: Burnsville Performing Arts Center (PAC) | BVL-1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cambridge: Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail | CAM-1 | 545 | 0 | 0 | 545 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Canby: Two Projects | CAN-1 | 887 | 0 | 0 | 887 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Carlton: Municipal Supply Well #4 Construction | CAR-1 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Centerville: Main Street Improvements (Anoka CSAH 14) | CEN-1 | 1,227 | 0 | 0 | 1,227 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Central MN Parks & Trails: 7 Projects | CEP-1 | 12,210 | 0 | 0 | 12,210 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chisholm: 6th Street SW/SE Road Improvements | CHS-1 | 1,300 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clearbrook: Community Center Roof Renovation | CLB-1 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 153 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clear Lake: Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility | CLL-1 | 4,725 | 0 | 0 | 4,725 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cold Spring: Downtown Riverfront Redevelopment | CO1-1 | 2,117 | 0 | 0 | 2,117 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Coleraine: Downtown Redevelopment, Street Reconstr. | CO2-1 | 860 | 0 | 0 | 860 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Columbia Heights: 49th Avenue Pedestrian Bridge | CO3-1 | 1,672 | 0 | 0 | 1,672 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cottage Grove: Gateway Corridor Enhancement Project | CO4-1 | 1,000 | 750 | 750 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Crookston: Flood Control - Ice Arena Relocation | CRK-1 | 12,889 | 0 | 0 | 12,889 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dakota County: Seven Projects | DAK-1 | 88,520 | 0 | 0 | 88,520 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dassel: Elevated Water Storage Tank Improvements | DAS-1 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deer River: Wastewater Treatment Facility Rehabilitation | DEE-1 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Detroit Lakes: Two Projects | DET-1 | 24,912 | 0 | 0 | 24,912 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dodge County: Stagecoach State Trail | DO1-1 | 3,028 | 4,728 | 1,304 | 9,060 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Projects Summary (\$ in Thousands)

| Dadas Ossats Fasa Ossasas IDDs Assas Dadinal at | D00.4 | 450 | 0.1 | | 450 | | | 0 |
|--|----------------|---------------|-------------|--------|---------------|--------|---|---|
| Dodge County Four Seasons JPB: Arena Parking Lot | DO2-1 DU1-1 | 150 20,655 | 0 33,275 | 0 | 150 53,930 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Duluth: Three Projects | | , | | | | | - | |
| DECC (Duluth): DECC/UMD Arena | DU2-1 | 40,283 | 0 | 0 | 40,283 | 40,283 | 0 | 0 |
| Duluth Airport Authority (joint request with city) | DU3-1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eden Prairie: Camp Eden Wood Renovations | EDP-1 | 7,788 | 0 | 0 | 7,788 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ellendale: Water System / Distribution Improvements | ELN-1 | 653 | 0 | 0 | 653 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ely: Two Projects | ELY-1 | 2,064 | 0 | 0 | 2,064 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fairmont: Winnebago Avenue Sports Complex | FAM-1 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Faribault: Three Projects | FAR-1 | 11,426 | 11,150 | 0 | 22,576 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fridley: Springbrook Nature Center SPRING Project | FRI-1 | 2,815 | 0 | 0 | 2,815 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gaylord: Three Projects | GAY-1 | 893 | 0 | 0 | 893 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gilbert: Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | GIL-1 | 861 | 0 | 0 | 861 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Glencoe: Morningside Avenue Upgrade to CSAH | GLN-1 | 1,250 | 0 | 0 | 1,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gonvick: Northern Emergency Training Admin Ctr | GNV-1 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Marais: Creechville Utility Extension Project | GR1-1 | 428 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Rapids: Two Projects | GR2-1 | 2,352 | 0 | 0 | 2,352 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Rapids EDA: North Central Technology Lab | GR3-1 | 6,165 | 5,000 | 0 | 11,165 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Rapids PUC: Wastewater Treatment Facilities | GR4-1 | 8,750 | 0 | 0 | 8,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grove City: Two Projects | GR5-1 | 3,050 | 0 | 0 | 3,050 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hamburg: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement | HAM-1 | 334 | 0 | 0 | 334 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hennepin County: Three Projects | HE1-1 | 54,634 | 0 | 0 | 54,634 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hennepin County RRA: Southwest Transitway | HE2-1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hibbing: Central Range Renaissance Project | HIB-1 | 25,000 | 5,000 | 0 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Houston County: Root River Trail Extension | HOU-1 | 1,641 | 701 | 950 | 3,292 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hoyt Lakes, Town of White: Laskin Energy Park | HOY-1 | 881 | 0 | 0 | 881 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International Falls: Voyageurs Heritage Center | INF-1 | 6,487 | 0 | 0 | 6,487 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Inver Grove Heights: Heritage Village Park | ING-1 | 4,600 | 0 | 0 | 4,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iron Junction: Sewer Expansion Project | IRJ-1 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Itasca County: Public Infrastructure to Support MSI | ITA-1 | 67,000 | 0 | 0 | 67,000 | 6,200 | 0 | 0 |
| Jackson County: Prairie Ecology Regional Center | JAC-1 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kasson: 16th Street Bridge & Road Improvements | KAS-1 | 4,963 | 0 | 0 | 4,963 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Koochiching County: Renewable Energy Clean Air Project | KOO-1 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| La Crescent: Wagon Wheel Rec & Commuter Trail | LAC-1 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lindstrom: Two Projects | LIN-1 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Litchfield: Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | LIT-1 | 7,150 | 825 | 0 | 7,975 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mankato: Civic Center/Arena Expansion | MAN-1 | 1,200 | 10,000 | 5,000 | 16,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Marshall: M.E.R.I.T. Center Expansion | MAR-1 | 12,501 | 7,925 | 5,239 | 25,665 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Medford: Wastewater Treatment & Water System | MED-1 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Minneapolis: Eight Projects | MI1-1 | 97,240 | 54,800 | 7,400 | 159,440 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minneapolis Park & Rec Board: Five Projects | MI2-1 | 20,700 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 40,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minnesota Valley RRA: Railroad Rehab - Phase V | MI3-1 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 0 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Moose Lake: Wastewater Collection & Treatment Facility | MO1-1 | 2,600 | 0 | 0 | 2,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|---|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|---|---|
| Moose Lake Water & Light Cmssn: So. Substation | MO2-1 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mt. Lake: Fire and Ambulance Facility | MTL-1 | 539 | 0 | 0 | 539 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nassau: Nassau Fire Station | NAS-1 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| New York Mills: Water and Sewer Improvements | NEY-1 | 991 | 368 | 317 | 1,676 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nisswa: Nisswa Lake Park & Beach Acquisition & Dev. | NIS-1 | 1,785 | 2,600 | 0 | 4,385 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Mankato: Caswell Park Expansion | NMN-1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northfield: Public Safety & Regional Emergency Ctr | NRF-1 | 5,040 | 1,000 | 0 | 6,040 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Northome: Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project | NRT-1 | 4,975 | 0 | 0 | 4,975 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City of Oak Park Heights: Reconstruct TH36 Frontage Rds | OAK-1 | 1,354 | 0 | 0 | 1,354 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Olivia: SW Storm Sewer Project | OLI-1 | 821 | 1,467 | 0 | 2,288 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Olmsted County: Regional Public Safety Training Ctr | OLM-1 | 3,655 | 0 | 0 | 3,655 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ortonville: Ortonville Regional Parks Improvments | ORT-1 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Osseo ISD #279: Northwest Henn Family Svc Ctr | OSS-1 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Palisade: Annexation Infrastructure for Wastewater Sys | PAL-1 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Paynesville: Washburne Ave Improvement Project | PAY-1 | 925 | 0 | 0 | 925 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pemberton: Pemberton Community Center | PEM-1 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pierz: TH 25 / Main Street Reconstruction | PIE-1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pine Island: Elk Run Public Infrastructure development | PII-1 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pope county: West Central Treatment & Correctional Ctr | POP-1 | 12,108 | 0 | 0 | 12,108 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Princeton: Joint Public Safety Building | PRN-1 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proctor: Kirkus St. Sanitary Sewer & Drinking Water | PRO-1 | 1,499 | 0 | 0 | 1,499 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ramsey County: Three Projects | RAM-1 | 3,440 | 1,250 | 1,250 | 5,940 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ramsey County RRA: Two Projects | RCR-1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Red Rock Corridor Commission: Two Projects | RED-1 | 12,000 | 0 | 0 | 12,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Richmond: Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion | RIC-1 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rochester Mayo Civic Center Expension | ROC-1 | 37,500 | 0 | 0 | 37,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rockford: Flood Control Project | ROF-1 | 1,550 | 0 | 0 | 1,550 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rockville: Rocori Trail | ROK-1 | 2,020 | 0 | 0 | 2,020 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roseau: East Diversion Flood Control Project | ROS-1 | 10,900 | 0 | 0 | 10,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roseville: Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL | RSV-1 | 695 | 0 | 0 | 695 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Scott County: Regional Public Safety Training Facility | SCT-1 | 3,200 | 0 | 0 | 3,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Silver Bay: Seven Projects | SIL-1 | 2,980 | 0 | 0 | 2,980 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| South St Paul: N. Urban Regional Trail Underpass | SSP-1 | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St Cloud: Two Projects | ST1-1 | 17,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 19,000 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 |
| St Louis & Lake Counties RRA: North Shore Express | ST2-1 | 1,655 | 0 | 0 | 1,655 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St Louis County: Two Projects | ST3-1 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St Louis Park: Two Projects | ST4-1 | 19,000 | 0 | 0 | 19,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| St Paul: Four Projects | ST5-1 | 47,000 | 0 | 0 | 47,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Steele County: Minnesota Wildlife Art Gallery | ST6-1 | 1,254 | 0 | 0 | 1,254 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thief River Falls: Two Projects | TRF-1 | 2,755 | 0 | 0 | 2,755 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Grants to Political Subdivisions

Projects Summary (\$ in Thousands)

| Two Harbors: Water Treatment Plant Capacity increase | TWH-1 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|---|-------|-------------|-----------|----------|-------------|----------|-----|-----|
| Upper Sioux Community: Water System Improvement | USC-1 | 775 | 0 | 0 | 775 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Vernon Center: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement | VER-1 | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 1,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Virginia: Mining Haul Road Economic Development | VIR-1 | 1,825 | 0 | 0 | 1,825 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wabasha County: Lake Zumbro Restoration | WAB-1 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wadena: Wadena Regional Wellness Center | WAD-1 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington County: I-94 Corridor Transitway predesign | WAS-1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Western Mesabi Mine Planning Bd: Canisteo Outflow | WES-1 | 3,260 | 0 | 0 | 3,260 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wheelers Pt Sewer District: Collection & Treatment | WHE-1 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White, Town of: Road and Recreation Trail | WHI-1 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Williams: Wastewater Treatment Plant Repair | WIL-1 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Windom: Two Projects | WIN-1 | 1,075 | 0 | 0 | 1,075 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Worthington: Fire Hall Construction | WOR-1 | 1,565 | 0 | 0 | 1,565 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wright County: Regional Park Land Acquisition | WRI-1 | 8,000 | 0 | 0 | 8,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yellow Medicine County: Two Projects | YEL-1 | 1,300 | 0 | 0 | 1,300 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minnesota Military Museum | ZZZ-1 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | \$1,154,836 | \$167,840 | \$32,210 | \$1,354,886 | \$48,483 | \$0 | \$0 |

Requests Received from Local Political Subdivisions

The Department of Finance received local project requests for state capital funding assistance from a variety of local political subdivisions throughout the state. The Department received requests from 133 political subdivisions and four other entities on and around the July 1, 2007, statutory submission deadline. State capital funds are requested for a total of 184 separate projects. The complete submissions received are posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

These local requests are collectively grouped into this section of the capital budget as "Grants to Political Subdivisions." The section contains a project narrative for each political subdivision that submitted a capital budget request.

In cases where a political subdivision submitted more than one request, the narrative includes the project description for each project, presented in the priority order that was determined by the local unit. The dollar amounts listed in the Projects Summary table reflect the total amount of state funding requested for all projects submitted by a political subdivision.

A number of the requests seek state funding for a project on a trunk highway. For those requests the Department has changed the type of state funding requested to trunk highway bonding, since under the State Constitution only bonds supported by the trunk highway fund can be used for a trunk highway project.

Other Requests Received

Four additional requests were received by the Department of Finance. One of these was from the Upper Sioux Community, a federally recognized tribe. Because tribes are not political subdivisions of the state, they are not able to receive state general obligation bond proceeds. The project request from the Upper Sioux Community is included in this section, but the Department has changed the type of state funding requested to general fund appropriations.

A second request was from the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities (AMM), an organization representing member municipalities. Neither associations nor other types of nonprofit organizations are eligible for state

bond proceeds. The AMM request is also similar to a project being requested by the Metropolitan Council for a new grant program to metro area communities. For these reasons the AMM request is not included in this document.

A third request was from the Minnesota Military Museum, a nonprofit organization that receives state funding to support its operations at Camp Ripley as pass-through grants from the Minnesota Historical Society. The project request is included in this section, but the Department has changed the type of state funding requested to general fund appropriations

A fourth request was from the Tubman Family Alliance, another nonprofit organization. The Tubman Family Alliance did not partner with a local political subdivision in time for its request to be included in this capital budget document.

Statutory Criteria for Department of Finance Review of Local Projects

The commissioner of Finance must evaluate all requests from political subdivisions for state capital assistance based on the criteria contained in M.S. § 16A.86. The evaluation criteria are:

- the political subdivision has provided for local, private, and user financing for the project to the maximum extent possible;
- the project helps fulfill an important state mission;
- the project is of regional or statewide significance;
- the project will not require new or any additional state operating subsidies;
- the project will not expand the state's role in a new policy area;
- state funding for the project will not create significant inequities among local jurisdictions;
- the project will not compete with other facilities in such a manner that they lose a significant number of users to the new project;
- the governing bodies of those political subdivisions primarily benefiting from the project have passed resolutions in support of the project and have prioritized their requests when submitting multiple requests;
- the project has submitted a project predesign to the commissioner of Administration; and

 the state's share of project costs must be no more than 50 percent of total capital costs (except for local school projects or disaster recovery projects).

Following each political subdivision's narrative description of its capital project request(s), the Department of Finance provides a summary evaluation for these local projects, as required by the statute.

Local project requests are becoming more prevalent in the state capital budget process. In recent bonding bills, many local projects have received state funding, although non-state matching requirements have not been consistently applied to the projects. The underlying rationale for local matching requirements are several – match requirements recognize the local benefit of such projects, allow limited state funds to extend to additional projects to the extent supplemented by local funds, require local governments to have a greater stake in the success of a project, and enable the selected local projects to be developed at a higher level because of the infusion of state resources.

Albert Lea: Edgewater Park (Former Dump)

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Albert Lea)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Albert Lea, in Freeborn County

Project At A Glance

The city of Albert Lea is requesting \$2.5 million from the state complete the remediation and clean up of the former "Albert Lea Dump" site.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This 30-acre site is located at the northern end of Fountain Lake in Albert Lea, Freeborn County, in south-central Minnesota. It is one of the most used parks in Freeborn County with facilities for band performances, picnic areas and fishing. It is also home to the Bayside Ski Club for practices and performances.

From 1956 to 1972, the site served as the "Albert Lea Dump." During this time, the borrow pits were filled with mixed-municipal sanitary waste and open burning was practiced at the dump. After the site was closed in 1972, it was covered with 14 feet of lake sediment dredged from Fountain Lake. The city of Albert Lea subsequently developed the site as North Edgewater Park. This former dump site does not utilize any sort of leachate collection system, and as such, dangerous chemicals such as vinyl chloride and heavy metals flow towards the lake.

The Albert Lea Sanitary Landfill is located approximately one mile northeast of the Edgewater Park dump site. The construction of a new cell, properly lined with leachate collection, at the closed landfill has been proposed to accommodate the waste excavated from the Edgewater Park dump site.

The Edgewater Park site will be excavated to clean soil and hauled to the new cell. Two-thirds of the covered soil will be retained to restore the site.

In order to dispose of approximately 500,000 cubic yards of waste, a landfill cell approximately eight acres in size must be constructed with an average thickness of 30 feet.

In 2006, \$3.65 million was appropriated to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) for this project. The city of Albert Lea is requesting an additional \$2.5 million from the state be awarded to the MPCA for this project. Without funding, this project will be further delayed as contamination continues and costs increase.

There is a regional benefit for this project as cleaning up this site would greatly improve the water quality for a large portion of the Shellrock River Watershed District including Fountain Lake, Albert Lea Lake and the Shellrock River which flows out of the Watershed District into Iowa. The engineering firm hired to perform the analysis of the site has indicated that water quality will improve immediately upon waste excavation.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this project is \$6.15 million, for which the city received \$3.65 million through the MPCA in 2006. The city of Albert Lea would pay all of the costs associated with restoring the site once all of the contamination has been removed.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. The city of Albert Lea will be responsible for the long-term maintenance of Edgewater Park.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In the 2006 bonding bill, \$3.65 million was appropriated to the MPCA for this project.

Albert Lea: Edgewater Park (Former Dump)

Project Contact Person

Steven Jahnke, City Engineer and Director of Public Works City of Albert Lea 221 East Clark Street Albert Lea, Minnesota 56007

Phone: (507) 377-4325 Fax: (507) 377-4336

Email: sjahnke@city.albertlea.org

Governor's Recommendations

Albert Lea: Edgewater Park (Former Dump)

| | Fundamental and Business |
|-----|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | None for this contamination cleanup project. The city will pay all |
| | costs to restore the site once the cleanup is completed. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Environmental cleanup is an important state mission. The extent to |
| | which local projects of this type should be funded by the state is |
| | unclear and has varied from biennium to biennium. This project |
| | should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Albert Lea City Council passed a resolution of support on |
| | June 11, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for this type of project. |
| | _ |

Alden-Conger Schools: Alden Community Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$950,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Alden-Conger Schools)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Alden, in Freeborn County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$950,000 in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a new \$2.05 million multi-function facility to provide services to all age groups in the Alden area.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$950,000 in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a new multi-function facility to provide services to all age groups in the Alden area. The facility will be located in the city of Alden.

The ideas for the project began with a very generous donation from LaVerne Carlson, a local businessman. Between the donations while he was alive and the money left to the school after his passing, there will be \$350,000 available to assist in the construction and equipping of a community fitness center that will be available to the general public. The city of Alden is also a partner in the discussions and planning. The city is interested in the possibility of replacing their office and meeting space with a facility that is more accessible to the public and supplies the city with office and meeting space that is more conducive to today's needs.

The school is in need of space for Early Childhood Family Education (ECFE) and an updated science room that supplies the students and staff with the equipment and space that is needed to maximize achievement in the sciences. The ECFE classroom and parent space will be a great addition to

the community. The facility will add to the quality of the program that is offered and make the community an attractive home for young families. We have seen an increase in the enrollment in our ECFE classes, the added space would allow for more class choices and additional programming. We have seen the very positive impact that early involvement with the school has on children and families, that is why pre-school and all-day every-day kindergarten are free at Alden-Conger.

The project will be a resource for the entire area. The people of the Alden area are very active and interested in living a healthy lifestyle; the streets of Alden have many walkers and joggers. A community fitness center will give people the access they need to a facility that that can be used despite the weather. We have had a very positive response from the community for the project and believe that the impact on the health of our citizens would be significant.

The inclusion of new city offices with the schools building project would demonstrate the commitment that the community and school have to each other. We have worked well together on a variety of projects; this would be a visible demonstration of the teamwork and cooperation that exists in our communities and school. We believe that a joint project would impact the decision people had to make about choosing to live and work in a more rural setting. The city's share of the construction cost would be approximately \$250,000.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$2.05 million. The nonstate share of the project will be funded from three sources: \$350,000 local donation from a private individual; \$250,000 from the city of Alden; and \$500,000 from the Alden-Conger schools.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned and operated by Alden-Conger ISD #242. Construction is to begin March, 2009, with completion to be December, 2009.

Alden-Conger Schools: Alden Community Ctr

Project Contact Person

G. Joe Guanella Superintendent Alden-Conger Schools PO Box 99 215 North Broadway Alden, Minnesota 56009 Phone: (507) 874-3240

Fax: (507) 874-2747

Email: joeg@aldenconger.k12.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Alden-Conger Schools: Alden Community Ctr

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 54% of project costs are to be provided from non-state sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The project is viewed as having a primarily local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| _ | Not significantly |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Resolutions of support were anticipated to be provided after July 2007 |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| 9. | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | No, a predesign has not yet been submitted. |
| | , |

Annandale: Annandale Tactical Training Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$164,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Annandale)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Annandale, in Wright County

Project At A Glance

Annandale is requesting \$164,000 in state funding to cover 50 percent of the costs of upgrades to the Annandale Tactical Training Center (ATTC).

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The Annandale Tactical Training Center (ATTC) is in need of a total of \$328,000 in upgrades that will not only provide our Minnesota peace officers additional training resources, but will enhance and address issues which were not able to be funded at the time of construction due to prioritizing the needs of the facility.

The ATTC houses a 2,400 square feet, climate controlled, indoor live-fire shoot house which is used by federal, state, county and local law enforcement officers. Training courses offered annually: active shooter training in either school/public place, tactical training - SWAT, scenario based use of force training mandated by the Minnesota Peace Officers Standards and Training Board (POST) as well as terrorism/homeland security training.

When the facility was built in 2001, all the funding was provided by the city of Annandale's general fund. At the time, we did not have the funding to either add or improve portions of the training center for the following items: air quality - large air makeup system/air exchanger, sound dampening material for the walls/ceiling - noise associated with live fire exercises, steel breaching door to allow both mechanical and explosive type breaching, moving target

systems within the shoot house/and outdoor range and a 40 foot rappelling tower for high angle fire/rescue and police tactical training.

The ATTC. has agencies from all over the country attend classes offered here in Annandale, Minnesota. We currently have approximately 40-55 agencies annually utilizing the training center. The agencies may rent the facility for use by their department, attend classes sponsored/hosted by ATTC with national training instructors or use in-house ATTC instructors.

The facility allows agencies to conduct the mandated POST use of force and scenario based training. The costs are minimal to agencies that rent the facility. The average cost for a police/sheriff's department for a days training is \$600. The facility allows the agency to train up to 30 officers during a full training day, which in turn costs cities/counties approximately \$20 per officer/day.

Instructors/trainers from various states have instructed here in Annandale. Most instructors have ranked our facility in the top ten around the country, not to mention the fact that we are a small town with a population of 2,800 people.

In this day and age, law enforcement officers need to be trained in order to maintain the confidence needed to survive a deadly force encounter. It is a public expectation that police officers should not only be professional, but highly trained.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$328,000. The city of Annandale will provide \$164,000, which is 50 percent of the costs of the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Annandale owns, runs, and maintains the Annandale Tactical Training Center.

Annandale: Annandale Tactical Training Ctr

Project Contact Person

Jeffrey Herr, Chief of Police 30 Cedar Street Annandale Minnesota 55302 Office: (320) 274-3278

Cell: (320) 980-2408 Fax: (320) 274-2067

Governor's Recommendations

Annandale: Annandale Tactical Training Ctr

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| _ | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | The degree to which the project competes with other facilities |
| | depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic service area. |
| 8. | 2211122 011211 |
| 0. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Not yet received. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| ٥. | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| | |

Anoka County: Rice Creek No. Regional Trail Connect

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,334,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Anoka County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Anoka County

Project At A Glance

Anoka County is requesting \$2.334 million in state funding to assist with 69 percent of the cost of the design, engineering and construction of a four mile paved, multi-modal off-road trail that follows Rice Creek through Anoka County, connecting with trails in Washington and Ramsey counties.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2.334 million in state funding to assist in the design, engineering and construction of a four mile paved, multi-modal off-road trail that follows Rice Creek through Anoka County, connecting with trails in Washington and Ramsey counties.

This project has both local and regional significance with the primary objective of the Rice Creek North Regional Trail Connections Project being to develop a paved, multi-modal, off-road trail that will expand access into the Rice Creek Chain of Lakes Park Reserve, link with local communities, and connect to the Rice Creek West and Mississippi River Regional Trails. This project will complete a 16.5-mile regional trail corridor and also provide a connection to the National Parks Service Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, a 72 mile recreation corridor following the Mississippi River from the cities of Ramsey and Dayton south to Hastings.

The proposed project is an expansion of the existing Rice Creek North Regional Trail that currently terminates in the city of Circle Pines. A new trail will be constructed from a point just south of Golden Lake Elementary School

to a new northern terminus at the Lino Lakes Town Center development. Ultimately, the trail will complete a missing link connecting the Rice Creek trails to the Gateway State Trail in Washington County. The maps attached show the location of the trail within the Twin Cities Metropolitan region, as well as the regional and local trail connections.

The new off-road multi-modal trail will be just over four miles long and will be constructed to a 10 foot wide bituminous asphalt surface. It will include five boardwalk sections to minimize wetland impacts and three bridges over Rice Creek. In addition to these improvements, six cultural historical interpretive stations will be developed near bridges and boardwalks so that trail users may gain an enhanced understanding of the cultural and archaeological history of the Rice Creek Corridor. The existing Rice Creek North Regional Trail through Circle Pines will be improved from eight feet wide to 10 feet wide, and street lamps will be installed at all intersections with roadways.

All but about 0.8 mile of the trail will be constructed on land controlled by the Anoka County Parks and Recreation Department within the Rice Creek Chain of Lakes Park Reserve and the Rice Creek North Regional Trail Corridor. A portion of the trail will be on school district property at the Rice Creek Elementary School grounds. The crossing of Rice Creek on CSAH 49 (Hodgson Road) has been provided by the reconstruction of CSAH 49/Rice Creek Bridge project that was completed in 2006. The new regional trail will make use of the existing off-road city trail along the north side of CSAH 10 (Birch Street) between CSAH 49 and Rice Creek Elementary School.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$3.384 million. The county anticipates a Federal Transportation Enhancement grant of \$1.050 million to be available in 2009.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. Anoka County will provide daily maintenance of the trail, such as sweeping and mowing. The city of Lino Lakes will provide daily maintenance of the 0.8 mile trail along Birch Street in the city of Lino Lakes, while Anoka County will provide long-term maintenance, such as patching and overlays, of the entire trail.

Anoka County: Rice Creek No. Regional Trail Connect

Previous Appropriations for this Project

No amounts specified.

Other Considerations

Anoka County will own the trail. There is currently 31,500 square feet of existing 8' trail. This project will expand the 8' width to 10' and will create 39,270 square feet of new trail. Construction is anticipated to start in April 2009 and should be complete by July 2010.

The Anoka County Board adopted the regional Solid Waste Master Plan in December 2004. The Plan established the goal of incorporating sustainable building guidelines into its projects. While this project does not entail the construction of a building, the primary objective of this new trail is to provide alternative modes of transportation that link the out-lying suburbs with the urban areas of Minneapolis and St. Paul. This facility will allow for a reduction in fuel and transportation costs throughout the area, while reducing air emissions and providing health and recreational benefits to the surrounding communities.

Project Contact Person

John VonDeLinde, Director of Parks and Recreation Email: john.vondelinde@co.anoka.mn.us

Karen Blaska, Park Planner

Email: karen.blaska@co.anoka.mn.us

Anoka County Parks and Recreation 550 Bunker Lake Boulevard Northwest Andover, Minnesota 55304

Phone: (763) 757-3920 Fax: (763) 755-0230

Governor's Recommendations

Anoka County: Rice Creek No. Regional Trail Connect

| e non-state matching funds contributed? s will match 61% in state funding. fulfill an important state mission? ional opportunities is an important state mission in state has existing grant programs to provide ce in this area. |
|---|
| s will match 61% in state funding. If fulfill an important state mission? If fonal opportunities is an important state mission in state has existing grant programs to provide |
| fulfill an important state mission? ional opportunities is an important state mission in state has existing grant programs to provide |
| ional opportunities is an important state mission in state has existing grant programs to provide |
| state has existing grant programs to provide |
| |
| oo iii tiilo aroa. |
| nal or statewide significance? |
| wed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| onal state operating subsidies required? |
| |
| een expanded in a new policy area? |
| |
| ated among local jurisdictions? |
| cal jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| |
| pete with other facilities? |
| and a decrease interest of a consense. |
| ng body provided a resolution of support? |
| ounty Board adopted a resolution of support on |
| ng body prioritized among all projects it is |
| ng body phontized among an projects it is |
| |
| (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| (|
| gn is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| pathways. |
| |

Anoka-Sherburne-Wright: Regional Crime Lab

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Anoka-Sherburne-Wright JPA)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Andover, in Anoka County

Project At A Glance

- This request is for \$6 million in state funding to assist with 23 percent of the cost to design, construct, furnish and equip a forensic crime laboratory to process forensic evidence.
- This Crime Lab will be operated jointly by the Anoka, Sherburne and Wright County Sheriff's Offices and will be attached to a new Public Safety Campus in Anoka County.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$6 million in state funding to assist in the design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a forensic crime laboratory to process forensic evidence. The Crime Lab will be operated jointly by the Anoka, Sherburne and Wright County Sheriff's Offices and will be attached to a new Public Safety Campus in Anoka County.

Currently all forensic type evidence (DNA, toxicology and serology) is submitted and processed at the state's Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA) laboratory in St. Paul. The amount of evidence submitted overwhelms the laboratory capacity resulting in backlogs and lengthy delays for local investigations and prosecutions.

The delays permit criminals to continue to operate as investigations await testing results, or the delays force counties to hold suspects in custody for extended periods of time awaiting trial. Both consequences of the system inadequacy impose significant costs to the community.

The existing model of evidence processing assigns priority to the analysis of evidence related to the most serious crimes against persons, including homicide, assault and sex crime, while excluding the majority of property crimes. Yet even this limited model overloads the BCA's capacity.

The three partnering counties currently submit only eight to ten percent of their total evidence collections to the BCA due to limitations imposed by BCA. Four to five times that amount of forensic evidence accumulates unprocessed. Further, a notable amount evidence, mainly property crime related, goes uncollected due to the capacity issue.

Multiple studies indicate that homicide and CSC suspects have commonly been in the criminal justice system earlier in time as a result of the commission of other less violent type crimes. Additional studies indicate that the arrest of individuals for a single property crime may prevent the commission of seven additional crimes. It is vital that new facilities be built to allow for evidence processing that includes property crimes.

The proposed laboratory will provide relief at the state, regional and local level. By removing the evidence of these three counties from its work load, the state BCA facility will be able to increase its processing of evidence from other jurisdictions both local and regionally. he state also benefits as the operational costs for this laboratory are shared by the three counties.

As a further benefit to local and regional agencies, the facility has the potential to provide service to other counties as needed/requested or to assist the BCA facility in instances of extreme need.

Anoka, Sherburne and Wright Counties have made a commitment to bring an increase in critical forensic services to their region. The quality of life for citizens in the area will be greatly impacted by this facility. The plan proposed by these agencies allows the counties to make the necessary progress towards facility and instrumentation modernization as well as an expansion of services. These enhancements will improve the quality and timeliness of the forensic science services provided to the community and will allow the laboratory to meet community expectations.

Anoka-Sherburne-Wright: Regional Crime Lab

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$26.058 million. Anoka county will sell G.O. capital improvement bonds to finance \$20.058 million of the project cost.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The costs of operating the facility will be shared by the three partnering counties. The cost to operate the facility will be born directly by its users. In 2004 in an article in the Journal of Biolaw and Business it was estimated that every dollar spent on forensic analysis provides a return of \$35 to the community. Local users will see cost benefits as criminals enter the criminal justice system at faster rates and are identified earlier in their career.

The administration of the laboratory will be through an Advisory council contractually established by the three partners.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by Anoka County. Construction of the facility is expected to begin in late September or early November of 2007. Occupancy for the facility should occur in March/April of 2009.

The Anoka County Board adopted the regional Solid Waste Master Plan on 12-14-04. The Plan established the goal of incorporating sustainable building guidelines into its projects. To help achieve these goals the county has hired a Sustainable Design Consultant to evaluate how closely the current design of the Public Safety Facility meets B3 requirements and to recommend revisions if there are some areas that do not meet B3. The design intent is for the entire Public Safety Facility, which includes the Crime Lab, to meet the State B3 requirements by submitting the required B3 documentation for review by the Center for Sustainable Building Research (CSBR).

Project Contact Person

Captain Robert Aldrich Anoka County Sheriff's Office 325 E Main Street Anoka Minnesota 55303 Phone: (763) 323-5006

Fax: (763) 422-7503

Email: robert.aldrich@co.anoka.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Anoka-Sherburne-Wright : Regional Crime Lab

| Evaluation of Local Projects To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 77% of project costs are to be provided from local governme Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | nt funds |
|---|-------------|
| 77% of project costs are to be provided from local governmeDoes project help fulfill an important state mission? | nt funds |
| 2. Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | iit iulius. |
| Public safety laboratory facilities are an important state missi | on in |
| Minnesota. However, the degree to which local projects sho | |
| funded, as contrasted with state projects, is unclear. | uid be |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| No. | |
| 5. Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| Public safety laboratory facilities are an important state missi | on in |
| Minnesota. However, the degree to which local projects sho | |
| funded, as contrasted with state projects, is unclear. | ald bc |
| Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding fo | r similar |
| projects. | · Oiiiiiai |
| 7. Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| The state operates two laboratories under the BCA at the | |
| Department of Public Safety. | |
| 8. Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| Yes, the Anoka County Board adopted a resolution of support | rt on |
| February 27, 2007. | |
| 9. Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| requesting? | |
| N/A | |
| 10. Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 miles) | illion) |
| been submitted? | |
| Not yet submitted. | |

Arden Hills: TH 10/CR 96, CR H/I-35W interchngs

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$29,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Arden Hills)

PROJECT LOCATION: Arden Hills and Mounds View, in Ramsey County

Project At A Glance

The city of Arden Hills requests \$29 Million in state funding to cover 50 percent of the cost to acquire land, conduct preliminary design, final design, and construction of the Highway 10/County Road 96 interchange and the County Road H/I-35W interchange in Ramsey County, city of Arden Hills and city of Mounds View.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$29 million in state funding to acquire land, conduct preliminary design, final design, and construction of the Highway 10/County Road 96 interchange and County Road H/I-35W interchange in Ramsey County, city of Arden Hills and city of Mounds View. This \$29 million investment by the state will help spur private economic development totaling more than \$800 million dollars over the next 10 years. These transportation improvements have been a high priority to the region for many years, but transportation funding has not been available to implement them.

In anticipation of the redevelopment of the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant (TCAAP) area in Arden Hills, the city has taken the lead on pulling the stakeholders together and is working closely with the Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT), Ramsey County and the surrounding cities to build new and modify existing interchanges in advance of Mn/DOT's ability to build major improvements. At the time of this application submittal, Mn/DOT has approved the preliminary design for the I-35W/County Road H improvement and is supporting the design concept for Highways 10 and 96. To date,

Mn/DOT has regularly participated in the planning process for these improvements. These improvements will provide state and regionally significant benefits to the traveling motorist by removing bottlenecks, which will reduce travel time, improve air quality and reduce crashes.

Beyond the direct positive impact to the traveling motorist that these interchanges will have, the redevelopment of the TCAAP site will transform what has been a federally-owned underdeveloped landscape for decades, into a sustainable mixed-use community, providing places for people to live, work, shop and recreate. The following illustrate a few of the tremendous impacts redevelopment at TCAAP will have on the local and regional area:

- ◆ Foster Economic Development The TCAAP site is conveniently located within a 10 mile radius of the Minneapolis and St. Paul central business districts. The redevelopment project will create approximately 7,500 new jobs. This will significantly increase employment and income opportunities for those living within the region. New or enhanced businesses will also generate additional property tax revenue to the benefit of the counties, cities, and townships.
- Provide an alternative to sprawl The redevelopment project will promote compact development and add approximately 2,500 households within the TCAAP site which will include a range of housing types for a diverse and aging population. The new homes will be located in close proximity to major economic centers within the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.
- Address safety concerns at Highways 10 and 96 This intersection is rated the 43rd worst intersection in the state. The new design will foster safety and pedestrian mobility across three highways (10, 96 and I-35W)
- ◆ Promote Environmental Stewardship The project will clean up contamination (groundwater, soil, sediment, and surface water) that resulted from past ammunition manufacturing operations at the facility. This includes the removal of over 160 blighted structures from the site.
- Provide recreational opportunities Over 150 acres of parks and open spaces are being planned at TCAAP. These destinations will be connected by a system of trails, sidewalks and open space corridors to serve the regional and local residents.
- ◆ Transfer federal land back to the tax rolls The opportunity to put this site back on the tax rolls will have significant impact to the state, Schools, city of Arden Hills and Ramsey County. The proposed

Arden Hills: TH 10/CR 96, CR H/I-35W interchngs

development would add between \$800 million to \$1 billion of market value to the property tax system.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$58 million. Non-state sources will cover 50 percent of the project costs through Federal, Ramsey County, city of Arden Hills, city of Mounds View and/or private funds.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

Mn/DOT will own and operate the improvements on Highway 10 and I-35W.

Other Considerations

Mn/DOT will own and operate the improvements on Highway 10 and I-35W. Ramsey County will own and operate the improvements on County Road 96 and County Road H. The project construction will begin in September 2008 and continue until September 2010.

Project Contact Person

Michelle Wolfe City Administrator City of Arden Hills 1245 West Highway 96 Arden Hills, Minnesota 55112

Email: michelle.wolfe@ci.arden-hills.mn.us

Phone: (651) 792-7810

Governor's Recommendations

Arden Hills: TH 10/CR 96, CR H/I-35W interchngs

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation and economic development is an important state |
| | mission. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and |
| | Mn/DOT are responsible for transportation planning and |
| | programming and prioritizing state funding for transportation projects. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | This project should be considered alongside the other transportation |
| | plans and projects that are under discussion for the metropolitan |
| | area. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Arden Hills City Council adopted a resolution on May 29, |
| | 2007, and the Mounds View City Council adopted one on June 11, |
| | 2007. The Ramsey County Board adopted a resolution of support on |
| 9. | June 17, 2007. Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| ð. | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| 10. | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |

Aurora: Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase II

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$800,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Aurora)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Aurora, in St. Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Aurora is requesting \$800,000 in state funding to cover 20 percent of the costs to complete a very large and comprehensive Wastewater Facility Improvement Project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Aurora is requesting \$800,000 in state funding to complete a very large and comprehensive Wastewater Facility Improvement Project. The proposed project will include headwork flow monitoring, new primary and secondary clarifiers, a flow equalization basin, addition of a second aeration tank, addition of expanded filtration capacity and necessary support piping and electrical upgrades.

The city of Aurora operates a sanitary sewer collection system and wastewater treatment facility that serves residents within the city and some residential connections outside the city limits. The collection system flows by gravity to the treatment plant that includes secondary treatment with effluent filtration. Treated effluent is discharged to Silver Creek (Class 2 water) which is a tributary of the upper St. Louis River. The original plant was constructed in 1957 as a secondary treatment facility utilizing a trickling filter for biological treatment and a single stage anaerobic digester for sludge stabilization. The facility was upgraded in 1980 to activated sludge biological treatment with effluent filtration. No changes were made to the anaerobic digester.

The city of Aurora has closely reviewed and studied each project component based on engineering data and recommendations. This funding request is directed at upgrading several deficiencies with the city of Aurora Wastewater Collection System.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) is requiring the city of Aurora to eliminate overflows for up to the peak instantaneous wet weather flow (defined as the 25 year, one-hour storm event) to the wastewater treatment facilities by year 2010. Currently, equipment has been installed to measure wastewater overflows at the wastewater treatment facilities. The data collected has been used to size pumping, clarification, filtration and flow equalization facilities that would be needed to handle peak wet weather flows. Currently, plant personnel have to bypass the filtration facilities during wet weather periods because of the limited filtration capacity and the plugging of the filters with solids washout from the final clarifiers.

The primary focuses of the Phase II Improvements include the following:

- Elimination of bypasses for all but the most severe storm events.
- Replacement of inadequate 50 year old primary and secondary clarifiers.
- ◆ Increase the Wastewater Plant capability to add new connections to the existing sewer system.

The primary objective of the Aurora Wastewater Facility Improvements is to create a suitable living environment. The project is designed to maintain existing sanitary sewer services for all city of Aurora residents and more importantly to enable potential growth in housing and business development.

The city of Aurora is anticipating and planning for growth due to the large industrial development in progress in the East Range Area. The proposed Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements are essential to provide quality services to existing residents and prepare for the future of the entire East Range Area.

The East Range Area is in an expansion and growth trend. The recent completion of the White Community Hospital Expansion and the new Mesabi East School District \$18.8 million facility project in progress are the leading examples.

Aurora: Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase II

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of the Phase II Improvements project is \$4.04 million. Eighty percent of the total costs for Phase II will come from non-state sources:

| Non-State Funding Source | Amount |
|--|-------------|
| St. Louis County Community Development Block Grant | \$240,000 |
| Iron Range Resources | 200,000 |
| Army Corps of Engineers | 500,000 |
| City of Aurora – Phase I Excess | 100,000 |
| City of Aurora – Debt Issuance / Rates | \$2,200,000 |

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The city of Aurora received \$1.5 million from the State Wastewater Infrastructure Fund in 2006 as part of the Phase I Improvements Project. Phase I was the result of an explosion, which occurred in May 2004 at the Wastewater Plant. The explosion occurred near the vent piping of the digester, which blew out the walls of the digester/control building and collapsed the roof of the building. Fortunately, the building was not occupied during the explosion and no personnel were injured. Temporary facilities were added to maintain power to provide wastewater pumping, and to maintain chlorination. Sludge in the digester tank was hauled to the Western Lake Superior Sanitary District (WLSSD) for treatment.

During 2004 a new operations building was constructed containing a new motor control center. A new chlorine building was added and the wastewater pumps rehabilitated.

Phase I improvements to the city of Aurora Facility included the addition of a primary digester, digester building, sludge truck gauge, and a reconditioned wet well containing submersible wastewater pumps. The contract for this project was awarded in 2005. Construction of Phase I at the Wastewater Plant is 95 percent completed.

Other Considerations

The city of Aurora owns and operates the Wastewater Treatment Facility. The city of Aurora commits that following the completion of the project it will

maintain the project site in good operating condition, appearance, and repair and protect the same from deterioration, reasonable wear and tear resulting from ordinary use of the property excepted for as long as the city retains ownership of the project site.

Project Contact Person

Linda Cazin City Clerk/Treasurer PO Box 160

Aurora, Minnesota 55705 Phone: (218)-229-2614 Fax: (218) 229-3198

Email: cityclerk@ci.aurora.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Aurora: Wastewater Treatment Facility Phase II

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Aurora City Council adopted a resolution of support on July |
| | 5, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | , |

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Narrative

Austin: Austin Area Success Center

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Austin)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Austin, in Mower County

Project At A Glance

The city of Austin requests \$3 million in state appropriations to assist in funding 20 percent of the costs of the construction of a 27,000 square foot Austin Area Success Center. This facility will house a number of existing community and regional service organizations for the citizens of the Austin and Mower County area.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3 million in state funding to assist in the site acquisition, design phase and construction of the Austin Area Success Center to be located in Austin, Mower County, Minnesota

The Austin Early Childhood Initiative (Austin ECI) is a broad coalition of parents, business and government leaders, child care providers, and family services agencies that formed in 2002. Austin ECI has developed the Austin Area Early Childhood Success Center plan as one critical part of a multifaceted community-based approach to ensuring better outcomes for our children.

The Austin Area Early Childhood Success Center is a one-stop shop location that brings together Austin's existing programs like the Community Child Care Center, the Parenting Resource Center, and Head Start, so that each program can best work to meet the needs of area families. Co-location will increase access, increase family participation, enhance cooperation between

agencies, allow for program growth, and will provide the adequate well-designed physical space needed for high-quality child care.

A cornerstone of the Success Center will be increasing Austin's child care center capacity, particularly infant care and short-term care. Over 50 infants are currently on the waiting lists at Austin's available licensed child care centers, which have full enrollment for all age levels. There is an urgent and critical need for quality back-up day care for families using home-based day care as their primary option. Demand for child care services in the Austin area have been increasing over the past five to 10 years and is expected to remain steady. Mower County's birth rate has been consistent for the past decade and is expected to continue at the same rate for the foreseeable future.

A critical element to the regional Success Center is providing visible, accessible, adequate space for existing programs that serve families and children. Families consistently report that they are unaware of existing programs or are unable to get to them. The Parenting Resource Center is currently located in the basement of a downtown bank. SEMCAC also has a basement office. These locations are difficult to find and operate only daytime weekday hours. Head Start programs Community Child Care Centers are run in locations that have no room for expansion, despite increasing demand. As a result, current family support programs; such as Crisis Nursery, Parenting Warmline and training and support for home-based child care providers; are little-known and under-utilized by the Austin area. Families and children will vastly benefit from being able to more easily learn about and attend these programs, which have a proven effectiveness.

Another key element in the Success Center is that it will meet the needs of the entire region, not just a certain isolated socio-economic segment. Studies show that parenting is a learned skill, and that all parents, regardless of educational attainment or economic status, can benefit from professional parenting guidance and support. People from all walks of life use the existing Parenting Warmline and Crisis Nursery services. The Success Center will house programs and services that all families use, like the city of Austin's Park and Recreation Department, an indoor park and play space for young children. These programs will not only make the Success Center a more attractive and useful destination for families, but will help defray the operating cost of the Success Center. A second phase may incorporate Mower County

Austin: Austin Area Success Center

Health and Human Services as a 2nd floor to the Center. All second phase costs would be covered by Mower County.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$6.219 million. The non-state share of the project is 54 percent. The city of Austin will contribute \$1,219 million from city sources. Nonprofit and private funding will provide another \$2 million for the project.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned and operated by the city of Austin.

With the state appropriation of this project, design would begin in the summer of 2008 with site demolition and construction beginning during the fall of 2008. Project completion and issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. Spring 2009.

A portion of the existing community and regional service organizations in their current locations have been unable to expand to fulfill their demand for services to the citizens of this region.

These organizations include, but are not limited to the following:

- Early Childhood Initiative
- Community Child Care Center and Children's Learning Center
- Parenting Resource Center
- SE Minnesota Citizen's Action Council
- Head Start
- Welcome Center
- **United Way**
- Austin Park and Recreation Administrative Offices

Mechanical system design may include geo thermal heating and cooling along with other utility design efficiencies through the Austin Utilities.

Project Contact Person

Craig Hoium

Austin Community Development Director

500 4th Avenue Northeast

Austin, MN 55912

Phone: (507) 437-9952 (507) 437-7101

Email: choium@ci.austin.mn.us

Jim Hurm

Austin City Administrator

500 4th Avenue Northeast

Austin, Minnesota 55912

Phone: (507) 437-9941

(507) 434-7197 Fax:

Email: ihurm@ci.austin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Austin: Austin Area Success Center

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 52% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? The project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Austin City Council adopted a resolution of support on June 18, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Not yet submitted. | |

Babbitt: City Garage Replacement

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$310,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Babbitt)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Babbitt, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Babbitt requests \$310,000 in state funding to pay 50 percent of the costs of a new City Garage for maintenance of mobile equipment.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$310,000 in state funding to design and construct a new City Garage for maintenance of mobile equipment for the city of Babbitt in St. Louis County.

The current garage is approximately 50 years old and has several structural and mechanical problems. Specifically:

- ◆ The cinder walls were not constructed with expansion joints or sufficient reinforcement and are badly cracked and deteriorating
- The roof is waterlogged and must be replaced
- The building is not adequately ventilated (The equipment bays must be ventilated per Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) standards and the ventilation and air quality in the lunch room and office must be improved)
- ♦ The lighting is substandard
- ♦ The building is poorly insulated and heating costs are high

The building houses and is used for maintenance of the city equipment used to support the Public Works and Public Utility functions. The city also provides space in the building for a St. Louis County Snowplow during winter months.

The current building will be demolished down to the slab. The current slab will be saved and a new energy efficient building will build on the same footprint. The new building will be constructed to be energy efficient and with lighting and ventilation improved to code. The renovation of the City Garage will include additional insulation, reduced roof volume and energy efficient windows to reduce heating costs. Lighting will be improved to standard. The garage area will include ventilation for control of diesel fumes and carbon monoxide for air quality and the office/lunch room area will be air conditioned and ventilated. The existing beams will be recycled to other projects.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$620,000. The city will provide a total of \$310,000 for the project, which is 50 percent of the project's costs.

Other Considerations

Predesign and Engineering for the project will be completed in 2007. Construction is planned to begin 7-1-08 and be completed 10-1-08. The city of Babbitt will be the owner and operator of the facility.

Project Contact Person

Peter L. Pastika
City Administrator
City of Babbitt
71 South Drive
Babbitt, Minnesota 55706
Phone: (218) 827-2188

Fax: (218) 827-2204 Email: info@babbitt-mn.com

Governor's Recommendations

Babbitt: City Garage Replacement

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | No. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Babbit City Council adopted a resolution of support on June | |
| | 18, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| 4.0 | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | N/A | |

Barnum: Municipal Supply Well & control system

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$250,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Barnum)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Barnum, in Carlton County

Project At A Glance

The city of Barnum requests \$250,000 in state funding for 50 percent of the costs to design and construct a new municipal supply well and upgrade the control system for the existing water system

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$250,000 in state funding to design and construct a new municipal supply well and upgrade the control system for the existing water system to serve the city of Barnum, Carlton County, Minnesota.

The public water system operated by the city of Barnum consists of one municipal supply well, a well house building for chlorine and fluoride addition, one elevated storage tank, and a distribution system that serves a significant portion of the residents within the city limits. The average water use in 2006 was 48,000 gpd, and the maximum water use was 140,000 gpd. Service connections within the community are metered and water is billed based upon recorded water usage.

The city of Barnum is currently served by only one municipal supply well (CW#1) that is not currently supplied with emergency power generating capacity. One issue reviewed during a municipal water system evaluation process is to determine if a water system is able to meet the peak daily demand with the largest well out of service. Since the city of Barnum has no back up supply well, and therefore no mechanical redundancy, it is not capable of providing even minimal water to meet public health and safety

needs in the event of an equipment failure with CW#1. Additionally, the city is vulnerable to contamination issues as no back up supply well is available.

Since this request is directed at providing mechanical redundancy within the water system related to water supply, the alternatives to consider are somewhat limited. The city has reviewed a "do nothing" alternative, however, it does not appear that this alternative would provide an adequate degree of public health and safety to the residents and users of the municipal system. Another option reviewed as part of this process was to construct a new municipal supply well (CW#2) to augment the existing water supply. The construction of CW#2 would also provide much needed mechanical redundancy and potential well head protection benefits to the city of Barnum.

Based upon review of the alternatives considered, it was determined that the city of Barnum should pursue the installation of another municipal supply well to provide water for the city system. The new installation would be designed such that the wells could be operated either manually or automatically to alternate between CW#1 and CW#2. The new supply well is also recommended to be equipped with a emergency backup generator so that an adequate water supply can be maintained and provided to the city residents and users at all times. In addition it is recommended that the controls and scada system for the entire water system including: CW#1 and CW#2 be upgraded/replaced and that new flow meters be installed and linked to the new system.

This project has both local and regional significance as it affects the public safety, health and welfare of all those living in the water service area.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$500,000. The city will contribute 50 percent of the project costs. The city of Barnum plans to fund the residual project costs by issuing municipal revenue bonds. Bonds will be issued in 2008 by the city of Barnum to complete the project if the requested funding is made available from the state of Minnesota.

Other Considerations

The city of Barnum will own and operate all facilities proposed for construction. The project will not include occupied space as a part of construction; however, efforts will be made to focus design efforts to meet all

Barnum: Municipal Supply Well & control system

required sustainability guidelines established. The city supports the design of air quality and lighting standards that create and maintain a healthy environment for our employees. The city will also be reviewing all building design to ensure that construction is completed with consideration given to long-term operating costs and energy sources.

Project Contact Person

Christopher Rousseau, P.E. Barnum City Engineer Office: (218) 722-3915 x220

Cell: (218) 393-5585

Governor's Recommendations

Barnum: Municipal Supply Well & control system

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| ١. | | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Barnum City Council adopted a resolution of support for this | |
| | project. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| 0. | requesting? | |
| | Yes | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| 10. | been submitted? | |
| | | |
| | Predesign is likely not required for this type of project. | |

Baudette: Water Towers

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$425,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Baudette)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Baudette, in Lake of the Woods County

Project At A Glance

The city of Baudette requests \$425,000 in state funds to pay 50 percent of the cost to design and construct two replacement water towers.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$425,000 in state funding to design and construct two new water towers. The two existing water towers need to be replaced due to their age and depleted condition they represent many concerns to the city. In addition, the city of Baudette has been advised that future maintenance and inspections will not be conducted due to such safety related concerns. The expense to repair the existing structures is cost prohibitive.

This project is of local and regional significance. The city of Baudette serves as the county seat and is one of only two cities in Lake of the Woods county.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$850,000. The city of Baudette will provide 50 percent of the project cost from city sources.

Other Considerations

The city of Baudette will own and operate the tower facilities. Construction of the project would begin in July 2008 and be completed in June 2009.

Project Contact Person

City Engineer Nathan Kestner 209 4th Street Northwest Bemidji, Minnesota 56601 Phone: (218) 759-9218 Fax: (218) 751-9665

Governor's Recommendations

Baudette: Water Towers

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 4 | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Yes, the Baudette City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 11, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| 0. | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| 10. | been submitted? |
| | |
| | Predesign is likely not required for this type of project. |

Bemidji: Bemidji Regional Event Center (BREC)

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$22,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of Bemidji)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Bemidji, in Beltrami County

Project At A Glance

The request is for \$22 million in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a Regional Event Center for the city of Bemidji to be located within the core of downtown Bemidji. The Bemidji community will be responsible for 50 percent of the cost of constructing the Center.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The request is for \$22 million in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a Regional Event Center for the city of Bemidji to be located within the core of downtown Bemidji.

The Bemidji Regional Event Center (BREC) will be a 3,500 seat multi-event arena with an attached conferencing space of approximately 10,000 square feet. The BREC will have Bemidji State University as the anchor tenant and will be designed as a multi-purpose facility to meet the needs of the north-central Minnesota region. It will be used for a wide variety of events with regional interest including conferences, trade shows, concerts, hockey and curling.

The city of Bemidji has been researching the need for a Regional Event Center since 1992. Since then, community and regional leaders have been involved in developing a vision for the Bemidji Regional Events Center. Also the city of Bemidji commissioned CSL (Convention Sports and Leisure) to develop a feasibility study for the project.

The BREC will have a positive impact on the quality of life for northwestern Minnesotans. As quality of life issues become more important for cities to be able to attract residents and businesses, Bemidji wishes to distinguish itself as a leader in the northwestern region of Minnesota in terms of a vibrant economic center with social, cultural and recreational opportunities. Bemidji has taken other steps towards this vision including a \$3.4 million Diamond Point Park improvement project, acquisition of additional park property, and the restoration of "Paul and Babe" at their waterfront park.

The BREC will fill a much-needed gap in terms of facilities in the region. In fact, every other region in Minnesota has access to an Event Center similar to the one described in this proposal, with the exception of Bemidji and northwestern Minnesota.

An added advantage for this project is that the city of Bemidji is partnering with Bemidji State University to create a facility that is beneficial to both entities. Bemidji State University has agreed to make the BREC the home of its hockey program. Having a stable anchor tenant for the Bemidji Regional Event Center provides leverage to allow for additional components, such as meeting rooms and conference facilities, making the BREC a flexible event center.

The BREC will enhance economic and cultural opportunities for the residents of northwestern Minnesota as well as securing a new home for Bemidji State University Division I hockey. Bemidji needs the state's participation to complete this project and secure its future as a regional center.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the Regional Event Center for the city of Bemidji is \$50 million. The Bemidji community will be responsible for 50 percent of the cost of constructing the BREC. The funds will come from bonding to be repaid by a ½ percent local option sales tax. The city voted 'yes' on a referendum on the extension of the local option sales tax in November 2006 and requested state authority to extend the sales tax for the local share of the BREC. The city is requesting state funding for 50 percent of the project cost -- \$3 million that it received in the 2006 bonding bill, and \$22 million from this 2008 request.

Bemidji: Bemidji Regional Event Center (BREC)

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The city of Bemidji received \$3 million in the 2006 Bonding Bill (Laws 2006, chapter 258, section 21, subdivision 11) to "predesign, design, and acquire and prepare a site for a regional event center."

Other Considerations

- The design of the BREC will use best practices for sustainable strategies as allowed within the budget. Sustainable strategies will be defined further in conjunction with the budget as the design of the project moves forward.
- The BREC will be owned by the city of Bemidji. The city anticipates hiring a private management firm to operate and maintain the Regional Event Center.
- Project Schedule:
 - ⇒ Construction Start: September, 2008
 - ⇒ Construction Complete (Certificate of Occupancy): August, 2011

Project Contact Person

John Chattin, City Manager City of Bemidji 317 – 4th Street Northwest Bemidji, Minnesota 56601-3116

Phone: (218) 759-3565 Fax: (218) 759-3590

Email: jchattin@ci.bemidji.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Bemidji: Bemidji Regional Event Center (BREC)

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| _ | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state role in funding civic center and community center style |
| | projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to |
| | another. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Bemidji City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 4, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign was expected to be submitted in October 2007. |
| L | |

Benson: East Pacific Avenue Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$725,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Benson)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Benson, in Swift County

Project At A Glance

The request is for \$725 thousand in state funding to cover 50 percent of the cost to acquire land, design, and construct a road around the Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail crossing to allow emergency vehicles (police, fire, ambulance) to gain access to service territory when a train is blocking the TH12 intersection in Benson.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The request is for \$725,226 in state funding to acquire land, design, and construct a road around the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) rail crossing to allow emergency vehicles (police, fire, ambulance) to gain access to service territory when a train is blocking the TH12 intersection in Benson.

The East Pacific Avenue Improvement is of extreme importance to the city for safety reasons. There are numerous trains that travel through the city each day. They often travel very slowly through or stop in the downtown area blocking all routes in the city center between the north and south side of town. During those times, East Pacific Avenue provides the shortest alternative route for emergency vehicles to access the portion of the city on the other side of the tracks.

East Pacific Avenue is underlain by very poor soils and is subject to severe frost boils and heaves. Often, in the spring, these conditions cause the road to become impassable, thereby blocking this emergency route for days of even weeks.

The road needs to be reconstructed to provide a safe and reliable traffic route for during any season of the year. Since East Pacific Avenue is bordered by the BNSF Railroad on the north side and sparsely populated rural property on the south it is not feasible to assess more than a small portion against abutting properties.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$1,450,452. The city will pay 50 percent of the project costs, through the city of Benson CIP.

Other Considerations

The road will be owned and maintained by the city of Benson.

Construction would commence in May 2012 and would be completed by October 2012.

Project Contact Person

Elliot C. Nelson, Public Works Director 1410 Kansas Avenue, Benson, Minnesota 56215

Phone: (320) 843-4775 Cell: (320) 760-0911 Fax: (320) 842-7151

Email: elliot.nelson@co.swift.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Benson: East Pacific Avenue Improvements

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| ١. | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | | |
| ۷. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Transportation is an important state mission. However, the extent to | |
| | which local road upgrades related to rail crossings are a state versus | |
| 3. | local versus railroad funding responsibility is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| 4 | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| _ | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| _ | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| _ | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Benson City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| _ | June 11, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| 4.0 | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, | |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. | |

Big Lake Sanitary Distr: Wastewater Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Big Lake Area Sanitary District)

PROJECT LOCATION: Perch Lake Township, in Carlton County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1 million in state funding to cover 11 percent of the costs to design and construct a new municipal wastewater system to serve the Big Lake Area Sanitary District, Carlton County, Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1 million in state funding to design and construct a new municipal wastewater system to serve the Big Lake Area Sanitary District, Carlton County, Minnesota. The territory for the Big Lake Area Sanitary District is located entirely within Perch Lake Township, and is also inside the boundaries of the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation.

Currently wastewater treatment within the District consists of individual onsite systems for each home or business, including conventional systems (septic tank with drainfield or holding tank), mound systems, or privies. Recent studies completed by Indian Health Services (IHS) on tribal properties indicate that many of these existing systems do not meet state construction requirements. Recent study and evaluation of the non-tribal properties completed by MATRIX Soils and Systems, Inc. indicates that 33 percent of the systems surveyed do not meet state construction requirements. The MATRIX evaluation also reports that 41 percent of the properties evaluated infringe on minimum well setbacks, 12 percent infringe on minimum set back distances from the lake, and 9 percent infringe on building setbacks required by State Building Code. Another concern highlighted by the MATRIX evaluation was the fact that 55 percent of the

properties evaluated do not appear to be able to be replaced on-site due to limited area and unsuitable soil conditions for on-site treatment.

Current land use trends indicate that the territory of the proposed Big Lake Area Sanitary District is a high growth / development area within Carlton County. The Big Lake Area Sanitary District was created with for the purpose of promoting the public health and welfare by providing an adequate and efficient system and means of collecting, conveying, pumping, treating and disposing of sewage within the District. The use of on-site treatment systems, within portions of the District, has been proposed to continue in accordance with a planned On-site Wastewater Management Program. The Sanitary Board would provide management and over cite of this program with the goal of assuring that those portions of the District without access to the sanitary sewer system will still be providing good, reliable on-site treatment of their wastewater. The District as the point of creation was charged to reduce the use of on-site treatment systems, and will thereby abate actual and potential pollution of surface water, groundwater, and Big Lake. The proposed improvements would meet these goals and provide for a safe, healthy lake for both residents and visitors to enjoy for years to come.

This project has both local and regional significance as it affects the public safety, health and welfare of all those living in the service area as well as those coming to enjoy the lake.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Big Lake Wastewater Improvements Project is \$9 million.

Other Considerations

The Big Lake Area Sanitary District will own and operate all facilities proposed for construction.

The project will not include occupied space as a part of construction; however, efforts will be made to focus design efforts to meet all required sustainability guidelines established. The board supports the design of air quality and lighting standards that create and maintain a healthy environment for our employees. The board will also be reviewing all building design to ensure that construction is completed with consideration given to long-term operating costs and energy sources.

Big Lake Sanitary Distr: Wastewater Improvements

Project Contact Person

Christopher Rousseau, P.E. – BLASD District Engineer

Office: (218) 722-3915 x220 Cell: (218) 393-5585

Governor's Recommendations

Big Lake Sanitary Distr: Wastewater Improvements

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 90% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Big Lake Sanitary Board of Managers adopted a resolution |
| | of support on June 25, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Blooming Prairie: 3rd St Sanitary & Storm Sewers

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,021,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Blooming Prairie)

PROJECT LOCATION: Blooming Prairie, in Steele County

Project At A Glance

The city of Blooming Prairie requests \$1.021 million in state funding to cover 58 percent of the costs to engineer and reconstruct the Third Street North Sanitary and Storm Sewer corridor.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The request is for \$ 1.021 million in state funding to engineer and reconstruct the Third Street North Sanitary and Storm Sewer corridor, located in the city of Blooming Prairie, Steele County, Minnesota.

The city of Blooming Prairie is at the top of the Cedar River Watershed. Rainwater runoff that falls west of the city is currently conveyed through the city's storm sewer system before entering the Cedar River on the eastside of the city. The Third Street North corridor includes a storm water pond which will improve water quality and sediment runoff. The installation of the trunk storm sewer and sanitary sewer facilities on the Third Street corridor will provide capacity in the storm sewer system for the conveyance of storm water flows and eliminate the cross connections that exist between the storm sewer and sanitary sewer. These improvements will reduce basement flooding and property damage that has occurred during past peak storm events. The proposed improvements to the Third Street corridor storm sewer would serve a 204-acre watershed. The flooding in the city of Blooming Prairie has occurred because of the contour of the community. The city is not located on a river, along a lake or even within a flood plain, so it does not

qualify from flood funding. However, the community has received extensive flood damage in 1993, 1999, 2000 and 2004.

Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$1.747 million for 2008. The city is requesting \$1.021 million in state funds for the project, and will cover the remaining costs through a General Obligation bond issue with special assessment and revenue support.

Other Considerations

The city of Blooming Prairie owns and operates the infrastructure within the community. The project schedule will be determined after funding request has been approved.

The city's Comprehensive Plan anticipates additional projects of \$572,000 in 2010 and \$265,000 in 2012, but the city does not expect to make additional requests for state funding for the 2010 and 2012 projects.

Project Contact Person

Michael G Jones, City Administrator PO Box 68

Blooming Prairie, Minnesota 55917 Phone: (507) 583-7573

Fax: (507) 583-4520 Email: CBP@SMIG.NET

Governor's Recommendations

Blooming Prairie: 3rd St Sanitary & Storm Sewers

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| . | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 42% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Not yet received. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| 0. | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| 10. | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| L | coparation projects, or mater and matter attainment |

Bloomington: Mall of America Phase II

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$192,185,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Bloomington)

PROJECT LOCATION:

Project At A Glance

The city of Bloomington and Bloomington Port Authority request \$192.185 million for the Mall of America Phase II to maximize the Phase II economic and tax generation potential for the state. Specifically, bonding is requested for the construction and related costs for public parking facilities required by the development of the 5.6 million square foot Phase II development.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$192,185,000 in state bonding to construct structured public parking facilities to support Mall of America Phase II in Bloomington. The bonds would be issued as user-financed general obligation bonds. Local and regional tax revenues derived from the project would be directed to repayment of the bonds. Therefore, this request for bonding authority would not compete with other requests for state funding of capital projects.

The approved preliminary development plan for Mall of America Phase II includes a 5.6 million square foot integrated mixed use center consisting of retail, hotel, office, residential and entertainment uses. The Mall of America is the most popular tourist destination in the State of Minnesota. The Mall of America annually attracts 40 million visitors, of which 13.6 million tourists are from outside of Minnesota. Of these visitors 5.8 million come to the region specifically to visit the Mall of America.

The Mall of America is one of the top taxpayers in the state. The Mall of America generated \$55 million in taxes in 2006 and has generated \$751

million in taxes since opening in 1992. It is estimated that Mall of America Phase II alone will contribute an additional \$75 million annually in state sales, income, and property taxes.

Economic Impact Analysis: The Department of Employment and Economic Development completed an economic impact analysis of the Mall of America Phase II. The analysis was based on data provided by the Mall of America and Armlin Damon and Associates. Please note that the analysis assumed that construction would begin in 2007 and the facility would be operational in 2011. Although the construction is now expected to begin in April 2009 and be completed by September 2012, the numbers below have not been inflated.

The analysis determined that the construction phase of the expansion will generate:

- ♦ \$220 million to \$402 million in additional State GDP per year
- ♦ \$179 million to \$315 million in personal income per year
- ♦ 3,700 to 5,860 jobs, primarily in construction related industries.

Two methods were used to estimate the economic impact of Phase II operations. The first looks at all expenditures as "new money to the economy," while the second looks at expenditures of Minnesota residents differently than non-Minnesota residents. The first analysis method suggests that the operations phase of the expansion will generate:

- ♦ \$431 million to \$699 million in State GDP per year
- ♦ \$262 million to \$478 million in personal income per year
- ♦ 6,740 to 9,570 jobs, primarily in retail trade and professional and technical services.

The second method suggests that the operations phase of the Phase II expansion will generate:

- ♦ \$281 million to \$454 million in State GDP per year
- ♦ \$181 million to \$326 million in personal income per year
- ♦ 4,390 to 6,230 jobs, primarily in retail trade and professional and technical services.

Bloomington: Mall of America Phase II

The Mall of America Phase II is an important project with regional and statewide benefits including jobs, tourism, and tax revenue. State bonding for public parking structures is required to allow this project to proceed.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the public parking facilities project is \$192.185 million.

Including all on-site public and private costs, the Mall of America Phase II development is a \$2.1 billion project

Other Considerations

Project construction will begin in April 2009 and be completed, with certificate of occupancy, by September 2012. Please note that the original project cost estimate was escalated to the later start date.

Project Contact Person

Clark Arneson, Assistant City Manager City of Bloomington 1800 West Old Shakopee Road Bloomington, Minnesota 55431-3027

Phone: (952)-563-8921 Fax: (952)-563-8754

Email: carneson@ci.bloomington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Bloomington: Mall of America Phase II

| | Evaluation of Legal Projects |
|-----|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | Bloomington is requesting user-financed general obligation bonds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Economic development is an important state mission in Minnesota. |
| | However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be |
| | funded by the state is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | The degree to which these types of local projects should be funded |
| | by the state is unclear. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Yes. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Bloomington City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 25, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is likely not required for this type of project. |
| | O |

Brainerd: Downtown Street & Utility Infrastructure

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Brainerd)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Brainerd, in Crow Wing County

Project At A Glance

The city of Brainerd requests state funding assistance of \$500,000 for the reconstruction of street and utility infrastructure in the historic downtown area

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Historic Downtown Street and Utility Infrastructure Reconstruction

The city of Brainerd is requesting \$500,000 in state funding to assist in the design and reconstruction of street and utility infrastructure including pedestrian oriented streetscape items, in the heart of Historic Downtown Brainerd. This is a project that has been discussed for numerous years but has had difficulty in finding the necessary support from private property owners due to the financial burden associated with special assessments. Financial assistance from the state will help reduce this financial burden to ensure business and property viability.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this street and utility infrastructure reconstruction project is \$1.47 million. City resources will provide \$875,000 of the project cost, and a \$95,000 donation will cover the remaining project cost.

Other Considerations

The anticipated start of the project is May 2009 and the project will be completed by September 2009. The city of Brainerd will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Daniel J. Vogt, City Administrator 501 Laurel Street Brainerd, Minnesota 56401

Phone: (218) 828-2307 Fax: (218) 828-2316

Email: dvogt@ci.brainerd.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Brainerd: Downtown Street & Utility Infrastructure

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 66% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Transportation is an important state mission. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Brainerd City Council adopted a resolution of support on June 18, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? N/A | |

Buckman: Tornado siren, pump house, park improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$95,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Buckman)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Buckman, in Morrison County

Project At A Glance

The city of Buckman requests \$95,000 in state funds to pay 100 percent of the costs for three projects: a tornado and storm awareness siren; water pump house repair; and park improvements including a block warming house.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$95,000 in state funding for multiple projects to be located in the city of Buckman, in Morrison county.

Project 1: Siren for tornado and storm awareness

Project 2: Water pump house repair

Project 3: Park improvements, including block warming house

The above projects have local significance, as they are located in the city of Buckman.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the identified projects is \$95,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Buckman will own and operate the facilities.

Project Contact Person

Tom Lutzke, Councilman and Park Supervisor 27222 93rd Street Pierz. Minnesota 56364

Phone: (320) 468-6391

Governor's Recommendations

Buckman: Tornado siren, pump house, park improvements

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| ١. | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information | |
| | | |
| _ | for any of the projects. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| _ | The state mission in funding these types of projects is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | These projects are viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | The state mission in funding these types of local projects is unclear. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | Other local units of government could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects if the state provides funding for this request. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Not yet received. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | No. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the | |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. | |
| | | |

Burnsville: Burnsville Performing Arts Center (PAC)

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$10,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Burnsville)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Burnsville, in Dakota County

Project At A Glance

The city of Burnsville is requesting \$10 million in state funding to pay 50 percent of the costs to design, construct, furnish, and equip a new performing arts center.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$10 million in state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new performing arts center facility located in Burnsville, Minnesota. The facility will be located in Burnsville's Heart of the city, which has received award-winning recognition for its mixed-use design and redevelopment standards. Constructing the Performing Arts Center will complete the multi-year, multi-million dollar Heart of the city area redevelopment. The Center will include an approximately 63,000 square foot facility with a 1,000 seat main theatre and a 150 seat black box theatre. The Center will also include space for visual arts displays, banquet space, rehearsal, class and meeting rooms in addition to office and support spaces.

The Burnsville Performing Arts Center would help to fulfill an important state mission by providing accessibility to arts and cultural activities. This project also supports the preservation of diverse cultural heritages and organizations through the accessibility of the facility to local, regional and national arts groups. In addition, through the wide variety of programming, performing spaces and multiple artistic uses of this facility the Performing Arts Center supports the mission of the Minnesota State Arts Board by fostering broad public participation in, and support for, the arts.

The Performing Art Center would help to fulfill other important state missions by generating local economy: expanding business opportunities, creating jobs, generating revenue and serving as a cornerstone for tourism, economic development and community development. The 2006 statewide report *The Arts: A Driving Force in Minnesota's Economy*, compiled by the Minnesota Citizens for the Arts, revealed "the excellence, scope and diversity of cultural activity in every corner of the state go beyond contributing to Minnesota's quality of life: the arts and culture make a significant contribution to the state's economy. Each legislative dollar invested is matched by local dollars. There is a return on investment to the state of nearly \$11 for every state dollar invested."

In early 2006 the city of Burnsville hired a theatre consultant to produce a business plan and feasibility study. Results of their research, which included a competitive analysis of similar types of facilities in the region and the state, found that Burnsville's Performing Arts Center would be a subset of the Minneapolis and St. Paul market. It would draw patrons from "south of the river" suburbs and would also provide a venue for younger, up-and-comer type performers.

The business plan concluded that having a main theatre of less than 500 or over 1,250 seats would put the Burnsville Performing Arts Center in too competitive a position with Minneapolis and St. Paul theater districts. Instead of competing with other similar venues, plans are already in place to provide expanded or satellite programming and performances for the Children's Theatre Company. There is a need for these types of programs "south of the river" and the city of Burnsville would continue to foster this partnership as well as search for other similar partnerships in the future. The Burnsville Performing Arts Center would not place similar facilities at a disadvantage, but would provide a significant contribution to the thriving and successful arts and culture industry in Minnesota.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$20 million. The city of Burnsville will pay 50 percent of the project cost.

Burnsville: Burnsville Performing Arts Center (PAC)

Other Considerations

This facility will be owned and operated by the city of Burnsville. Operation of the facility will initially be contracted to Compass Management, Inc., a professional theatre management company headquartered in Des Moines, Iowa.

Additional operating dollars may be requested at a later date if capital funding is not approved.

Project Contact Person

Craig Ebeling, City Manager City of Burnsville 100 Civic Center Parkway Burnsville, Minnesota 55337 Phone: (952) 895-4465

Fax: (952) 895-4464

Email: craig.ebeling@ci.burnsville.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Burnsville: Burnsville Performing Arts Center (PAC)

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 4 | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state's role in funding projects similar to this request has varied | |
| | considerably from biennium to biennium. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Not currently. The city's application indicates that additional operating | |
| | dollars may be requested at a later date if capital funding is not | |
| | approved. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| _ | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Burnsville City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | June 18, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign was submitted to the Department of | |
| | Administration and was found to be sufficient. | |
| | Administration and was round to be summer. | |

Cambridge: Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$545,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Cambridge)

PROJECT LOCATION: Cities of Cambridge and Isanti, in Isanti County

Project At A Glance

The cities of Cambridge and Isanti are requesting \$545,000 in state funding to pay for half of the construct the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$545,000 in state funding to construct the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail that is proposed to be a separated, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant bicycle/pedestrian trail connecting the cities of Cambridge and Isanti in Isanti County. This request has local, regional and state significance in the following ways:

Local Significance:

The local significance of the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail System is that it will provide an alternative mode of transportation in the Central Minnesota region, and health and recreational benefits for users. Once completed, the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail will connect Cambridge, Isanti and Isanti Township – the fastest growing area in Isanti County. This will decrease reliance on automobiles and allow young and old to bike or walk from one city to another – to the schools, business districts, and points of interest that each community has to offer. The trail will also be used for health and recreational benefits.

This project will improve existing trail conditions by 100 percent as there is currently no safe route to walk or bike between Cambridge and Isanti. A very busy State Highway 65 is the main corridor connecting the cities; there are

two paved township roads that also connect the cities. However, those have no shoulders and are increasingly busy and dangerous. Residents are thusly forced to use their vehicles to get from one place to another. A separated trail will provide them with the option of bicycling or walking to their destination.

Regional Significance:

This will be a regional trail and usage will go beyond the residents of the two cities and township. Connections from the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail to existing and future trail systems in the region will be relatively easy. It is envisioned that this trail will:

- ♦ Extend northward to Braham
- Extend southward to Anoka County, Rum River Trail
- ♦ Connect to Sunrise Prairie Trail in Chisago County, Willard Munger Trail, Mille Lacs Soo Line Trail, Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge

State significance:

As mentioned above, the vision is that the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail will become part of the state's larger trail systems. Isanti County currently has no state or regional trails but is eager to help facilitate such systems. The Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail is a starting point for creating a network of trail systems within Isanti County and outwards to neighboring counties and beyond. The corridor proposed for the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail (see enclosures for map) maximizes the environment for enjoyment and education. The trail is proposed to pass over an extensive wetland for approximately 1,900 feet and cross Isanti Brook. The wetland is listed in the Isanti County Biological Survey as significant in being a shrub swamp, a poor fen and a tamarack swamp containing Blanding's turtles. The wetlands traversed by the trail will be treated with sensitivity and the crossing will be an opportunity for environmental education and enjoyment. The suspended trail way over the wetland will be modeled after the walkway used at the Harriet Alexander Nature Center in Roseville, Minnesota. Steel pipes are pounded down into the hardpan below and wood stringers and planking are attached to them at a height above the high water line. There will be informational signs along the trail identifying the plants, animals and birds that are native to the environment and suggestions for ways people can help the environment.

Cambridge: Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Cambridge/Isanti Bike/Walk Trail is \$1.090 million. In addition to the state request of \$545,000, the cities of Cambridge and Isanti have identified a total of \$302,900 in non-state funds to be contributed to the project.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. Operation and maintenance of the Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail will be assured by a joint powers agreement between the cities of Cambridge and Isanti and Isanti Township. The three political units will cost share in the maintenance and upkeep of the trail

Project Contact Person

Tyler Sinclair, City Planner/ Economic Development Assistant City of Cambridge 300 3rd Avenue Northeast Cambridge, Minnesota 55008

Phone: (763) 552-3214 Fax: (763) 689-6801

Email: tsinclair@ci.cambridge.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Cambridge: Cambridge-Isanti Bike/Walk Trail

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Non-state sources covering 47% of the project costs have been identified. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing recreational opportunities via trails is an important state mission in Minnesota. The state has existing grant programs to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Cambridge city Council adopted a resolutio non June 18, 2007 and the Isanti City Council adopted a resolution on June 19, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways. |

Canby: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$887,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Canby)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Canby, in Yellow Medicine County

Project At A Glance

The city of Canby is requesting state assistance for two projects (listed in priority order):

- \$125,000 to assist in funding the replacement of the Canby Custer Creek bridge
- \$762,000 to complete infrastructure improvement for the development of an industrial park

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Replacement of the Canby Custer Creek Bridge

The request of \$125,000 in state funding will provide the city of Canby with funding to supplement local financing for the replacement of the Canby Custer Creek Bridge.

The Yellow Medicine County Engineer has reviewed the existing timber bridge and determined that replacement is necessary due to structural deficiencies. In addition to the structural deficiencies, the existing bridge is narrow and creates a hazardous traffic situation when opposing vehicles meet or when pedestrian traffic is present on the bridge.

The city plans to replace the existing structure with a concrete box culvert bridge. The new bridge will be wider, thus reducing the traffic hazard. The Canby Custer Creek Bridge is unique in that it is owned by the city.

Therefore, the bridge is not eligible for other roadway and bridge improvement funding sources.

This bridge has local significance in providing access for emergency vehicles to the surrounding residential area. Two streets provide access to the southeast residential area. Loss of access, due to failure of the Canby Custer Creek Bridge, would require emergency vehicles to backtrack and detour, increasing the response time for emergency vehicles.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the replacement of the Canby Custer Creek Bridge is \$250,000. The city of Canby will contribute \$125,000 to the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Canby will own the bridge.

Project Contact Person

Andy Sander Yellow Medicine County Engineer 1320 13th Street Granite Falls, Minnesota 56241

Phone: (320) 564-3331 Fax: (320) 564-2140

Email: andy.sander@co.yellow-medicine.mn.us

Priority 2: Canby Industrial Park Development

This request is for \$761,835 in state funding. The funding will provide the city of Canby with gap funds to supplement local financing to complete infrastructure improvements for the development of an industrial park. The improvements include installation of municipal water and sewer, storm water control, roads with curb and gutter. The property is owned by the city and is strategically located adjacent to the Canby Regional Airport. The state funding will allow the city to initiate the industrial park project and have developable land, build ready and available, for new business/industry. The city submitted a pre-application for Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) Business Development Public Infrastructure

Canby: Two Projects

Grant Program funding to finance the proposed improvements in 2006. The city was not invited to participate in the second round of applications.

As recently as 2000 the city of Canby had added 77 persons, an increase of 4 percent over the past decade. However, this population trend has slowly begun to reverse as area workers leave Canby and the surrounding region to find employment opportunities. In 2004 the city established an Economic Development Authority (EDA) for the purposes of enhancing economic development opportunities within the city and to facilitate negotiations, financing and to create employment opportunities in Canby.

As evidenced by the recent action of the Suzlon Rotor Corporation locating a major manufacturing facility in the region, the Canby EDA and the Canby Campus of Minnesota West Community and Technical College (MNWEST) recognized the growing demand for employees in the wind energy field and increased opportunities for new business growth. The Canby EDA is confident that wind energy industrial and business opportunities will increase exponentially in the Buffalo Ridge region in the near future.

MNWEST has a variety of educational programs included electrician, dental assisting, automotive technology, and diesel technology. Recently the campus initiated a Wind Energy Technology program for wind energy technicians. Having 16 acres of zoned industrial land build ready, combined with the educated future employees in the wind energy field, will position Canby in the forefront to compete for wind energy related industry and business opportunities as they arise.

As recent as this year, the EDA has had informal, preliminary discussions with interested parties for potential expansion of an industry in the Canby area. Completion of the project will provide the city with available lands; build ready, for industrial expansion.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost:

The total cost of the Canby Industrial Park Development is \$1.524 million. The city of Canby will contribute \$761,835 million to the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Canby will own the public infrastructure and roadways within the Industrial Park.

Project Contact Person

Steve Robinson, P.E.
Consulting City Engineer
225 6th Street
Worthington, Minnesota 56187-2368

Phone: (507) 376-5888 Fax: (507) 376-3310

Email: srobinson@sehinc.com

Governor's Recommendations

Canby: Two Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Priority 1, Replacement of the Canby Custer Creek Bridge: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. Priority 2, Canby Industrial Park Development: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Bridges and economic development are important state missions. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Canby City Council adopted resolutions of support for each project on June 22, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Project predesigns are not required for either of these types of projects. | |

Carlton: Municipal Supply Well # 4 Construction

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$125,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Carlton)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Carlton, in Carlton County

Project At A Glance

The city of Carlton requests \$125,000 to design and construct a new municipal water supply well.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$125,000 in state funding to design and construct a new municipal supply well to serve the city of Carlton, Carlton County, Minnesota.

The city of Carlton completed a Water System Evaluation and Feasibility Study in December 2001 to assess the current condition and future flows for the Carlton area. The conclusion of the study was the recommendation of several future improvement projects to be made to the existing city of Carlton water system. Several recommendations of the study have already been implemented by the city including a new connection to provide water to the city of Thomson (a neighboring community) and the Jay Cooke State Park. The city of Carlton is currently engaged in a contract to construct a new-elevated water tower that will be able to serve the Carlton Regional Water Service Area. The new, regional water system is capable of serving the city of Carlton, city of Thomson, Township of Twin Lakes, as well as Jay Cooke State Park.

This request will address water supply issues and the recommendation to construct a new-municipal water supply well to serve the Carlton area. The city of Carlton system is currently drawing water from two supply wells located in close proximity to the water treatment plant. These wells while

serving the city faithfully all these years are now reaching the end of their design life. One of the existing wells is scheduled for rehabilitation work, however, this well cannot be taken out of service for repair until the city has another suitable well available to provide water to the system users. The city has also been actively involved in wellhead protection planning with the Minnesota Department of Health. The new supply well is a necessary and important step in providing well head protection for the community.

Due to the overall age and condition of the existing water supply wells serving the city of Carlton, it is obvious that a new well must be constructed and the existing wells be made available for maintenance/rehabilitation in the very near future. Based upon these concerns and the Study recommendations, the city is requesting to be included in the 2008 Capital Budget Bonding Bill to help finance a portion of the project.

This project has both local and regional significance as it affects the public safety, health and welfare of all those living in the regional water service area.

Total Project Costs

The total cost of the project is \$250,000. The city will pay 50 percent of the project cost using municipal revenue bonds.

Other Considerations

The city of Carlton will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Christopher Rousseau, P.E. - Carlton City Engineer

Office: (218) 722-3915 x220 Cell: (218) 393-5585

Governor's Recommendations

Carlton: Municipal Supply Well # 4 Construction

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| L | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| • | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| ' ' | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Yes, the Carlton City Council authorized the requests for state |
| | funding on June 12, 2007. |
| 9. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| 40 | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Centerville: Main Street Improvements (Anoka CSAH 14)

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,227,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Centerville)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Centerville, in Anoka County

Project At A Glance

The city of Centerville requests \$1.227 million to design and reconstruct their Main Street.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1,227,000 in state funding to design and reconstruct Main Street (Anoka County CSAH 14) in Centerville, Minnesota. County Road 14 provides an important east-west connection between Lino Lakes, Centerville and other area communities, as well as providing access to I-35E and I-35W. This connection will also serve as the vital transportation route for access to the proposed economic developments in Eastern Anoka County.

County Road 14 runs east-west for 22 miles from Trunk Highway (TH) 10 on the west to TH 61 on the east. The eastern end of the County Road 14 corridor between I-35W and I-35E is the current subject for consideration of proposed improvements. It is currently an undivided two-lane roadway with gravel shoulders in the rural areas, and a two-lane street through downtown Centerville. Over 6,000 vehicles per day travel on County Road 14 near I-35W. Near I-35E and downtown Centerville, County Road 14 carries 12,000 vehicles per day. The importance of County Road 14 as a regional connection will only grow as the dramatic growth in the area continues. The population of the surrounding communities doubled between 1990 and 2000, and will double again before 2030. Recent residential and commercial development along County Road 14 and County Road 21 has occurred more quickly than anticipated and points to the explosive growth that is anticipated

in this area in the next 30 years. However, geographical and environmental constraints, as well as limitations to interstate access may limit opportunities to address accompanying traffic needs.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$2.455 million. Of the total cost, the city of Centerville will pay \$637,000; Anoka County will pay \$115,000; and the federal government will provide \$465,000.

Other Considerations

Construction is expected to begin in July 2008 and end in November 2009. The city of Centerville will own and operate this facility.

Project Contact Person

John Meyer Finance Director City of Centerville 1880 Main Street Centerville, Minnesota 55038 Phone: (651) 429-3232

Fax: (651) 429-8629

Email: jmeyer@centervillemn.com

Governor's Recommendations

Centerville: Main Street Improvements (Anoka CSAH 14)

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. | . To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | | | | |
| | 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. | | | | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | | | | |
| | Transportation is an important state mission. The state has existing | | | | |
| | grant programs to provide financial assistance in this area. | | | | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | | | | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | | | | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | | | | |
| | No. | | | | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | | | | |
| | See #2 above. | | | | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | | | | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | | | | |
| | projects. | | | | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | | | | |
| | Not significantly. | | | | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | | | | |
| | A draft City Council resolution has been provided. | | | | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | | | | |
| | requesting? | | | | |
| | N/A | | | | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | | | | |
| | been submitted? | | | | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, | | | | |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. | | | | |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$12,210,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Central Minnesota Parks & Trails

Board)

PROJECT LOCATION: Various locations in Stearns County

Project At A Glance

The Central Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Board is requesting state bond funds for the following projects (listed in priority order):

| Project | Local Government | Priority | State funds requested for 2008 | Local share to be provided for 2008 |
|---|----------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Dehler Property (60 acres) | City of Sartell | 1 | \$4,000,000 | \$4,000,000 |
| Quarry Park & Nature Preserve | Stearns County | 2 | 450,000 | 450,000 |
| Lindsay Lake area | City of Sartell | 3 | 1,550,000 | 1,550,000 |
| Warner Lake County Park | Stearns County | 4 | 410,000 | 410,000 |
| First Street North area | City of Sartell | 5 | 1,850,000 | 1,850,000 |
| Bakers Lake area | City of Sartell | 6 | 2,950,000 | 2,950,000 |
| River Bluffs Regional Park improvements | City of St. Cloud | 7 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Total | | | \$12,210,000 | \$12,210,000 |

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Dehler Property

This request is for land acquisition for parkland to meet the comprehensive plan goals adopted in 2003 addressing parks, recreation, and the environment. There are four properties of interest that have been identified through planning studies. The first priority is the Dehler property with a request for \$4 million in state funding for land acquisition of 60 acres for a regional park. Community members have been in support of acquiring property for parkland for both passive and active needs. Sartell has an impressive history of comprehensive planning. There have been numerous planning studies undertaken in the past several years - some of which have centered on preserving the natural open space character of the city of Sartell. In 1998, the city adopted the Parks and Trails Master Plan and in 2003 they adopted the Comprehensive Plan. More recently, in June 2006, St. Cloud State University Survey Institute conducted a survey for the city of Sartell to assist the city in assessing the community's level of support for continuing the collection of the half-cent sales tax that has been in place since 2002. The sales tax that has been collected thus far has helped fund land acquisition, park development and upgrades. Survey findings indicated a high level of support for park and recreation amenities. In fact, 89 percent of residents rated funding for land acquisition for natural areas, open spaces and nature parks as important or very important.

In 2006, a natural resources inventory (NRI) was completed and identified the Dehler property as being environmentally significant. In 2006, Sartell adopted an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) ordinance which directly relates to the mapping completed in the NRI. Recently, the ESA map was amended changing the importance level of the Dehler property that is presently a part of an Alternative Urban Areawide Review (AUAR). As part of the mitigation measures, the ESA map was required to be amended. The property is located along the Sauk River and has been identified as having natural features listed as most important. This would be a passive park used for walking and bird and nature observation. Acquiring this property would also allow the city to potentially connect to St. Cloud's Whitney Park. The Dehler property is in LeSauk Township and would be annexed into the city of Sartell as part of the orderly annexation agreement.

Over the last 20 years, Sartell has seen considerable growth: Sartell's population increased 181 percent between 1980 and 2000. The development that has been occurring has put more pressure on the land resources. In 2007, with an estimated population of 14,000, growth pressure continues to mount and the city has actively attempted to manage it through various means with varying levels of success. As land becomes increasingly scarce, the visual and environmental impact of development has become more obvious and of concern to residents. Managing development in a manner that is consistent with community values is of paramount importance to citizens. Sartell is located within the St. Cloud Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and in 2000, the St. Cloud MSA was 167,392. Because of the close geographical proximity to St. Cloud, Sauk Rapids, St. Joseph, and Waite Park, Sartell serves a regional base of residents as well as visitors from beyond. The area is forecasted to have a continued strong and steady growth rate so the need to preserve open space for a regional park in the immediate future is evident.

Total Project Cost

The total cost to acquire this property is \$8 million. The city of Sartell will use its half cent sales tax revenue, park dedication funding, and property tax to provide 50 percent of the project cost.

Project Contact Person

City of Sartell
Anita Rasmussen, Planning and Community Development Director
125 Pine Cone Road North
PO Box 140

Sartell, Minnesota 56377-0140

Phone: (320) 258-7306 Fax: (320) 253-3337 Email: anita@sartellmn.com

Priority 2: Quarry Park & Nature Preserve Land Acquisition

This request is for \$450,000 in state funding to assist with the acquisition of 39.5 acres of land located at Stearns County, city of Waite Park, T124N – R28W, Section 29, for the expansion of a regional park. This property is a key in holding in the established Quarry Park and Nature Preserve. The

proposed acquisition is bounded on three sides by the existing Quarry Park and Nature Preserve. This parcel would provide for the southern entrance for Quarry Park and Nature Preserve.

Total Project Cost

The total cost to acquire this property is \$900,000. Stearns county will cover 50 percent of the project cost with county capital bonding funds.

Project Contact Person

Chuck Wocken, Park Director 1802 County Road 137 Waite Park, Minnesota 56387 Phone: (320) 255-6172

Fax: (320) 255-6177

Email: chuck.wocken@co.stearns.mn.us

Priority 3: Lindsey Lake Area (135 acres)

This request is for land acquisition for parkland to meet the comprehensive plan goals adopted in 2003 addressing parks, recreation, and the environment. There are four properties of interest that have been identified through planning studies. The third priority is the Lindsey Lake area properties; this request is for \$1.55 million in state funding for 135 acres for a regional park.

The Lindsey Lake area is on the northerly edge of the city of Sartell presently located in LeSauk Township. The area would serve as a regional park and encompass 135 total acres with the potential in the future for an additional 64 acres for a total park area of nearly 200 acres. The opportunity and need to acquire such property exists. First, community members have been in support of such a project. Secondly, a NRI completed in 2006 has identified this area as having important environmental features, including upland vegetation, forest, and streams. Wildlife on the property includes Sandhill Cranes, Piedbilled Grebes, several kinds of ducks, and Great Blue Herons. There are three wetlands on the property and the mature oak trees and prairie species add to the biological diversity. Thirdly, an Athletic Field Location Study has identified the Lindsey Lake area as a prime location for a

regional park serving Sartell, surrounding communities and visitors from beyond. The area would provide an array of active and passive regional recreational opportunities. The active portion would house athletic fields, shelter facilities, restrooms and so forth. The natural conservation component would complement the active recreational area. It would preserve open space, wetlands and forests, while providing trails and scenic areas for the public to enjoy and utilize. This would include, picnicking, bird and nature observation, hiking, snowshoeing, and more.

Sartell has an impressive history of comprehensive planning. There have been numerous planning studies undertaken in the past several years - some of which have centered on preserving the natural open space character of the city. In 1998, the city adopted the Parks and Trails Master Plan and in 2003 they adopted the Comprehensive Plan. More recently, in June 2006, St. Cloud State University Survey Institute conducted a survey for the city of Sartell to assist the city in assessing the community's level of support for continuing the collection of the half-cent sales tax that has been in place since 2002. The sales tax that has been collected thus far has helped fund land acquisition, park development and upgrades. Survey findings indicated a high level of support for park and recreation amenities. In fact, 89 percent of residents rated funding for land acquisition for natural areas, open spaces and nature parks as important or very important. In 2005, the city of Sartell completed an Athletic Field Location Study in response to the comprehensive plan goals and strategies, which analyzed potential sites for a regional park that offers both active recreation facilities and passive nature areas. The Lindsey Lake area was one of the top areas chosen.

Over the last 20 years, Sartell has seen considerable growth: Sartell's population increased 181 percent between 1980 and 2000. The development that has been occurring has put more pressure on the land resources. In 2007, with an estimated population of 14,000, growth pressure continues to mount and the city has actively attempted to manage it through various means with varying levels of success. As land becomes increasingly scarce, the visual and environmental impact of development has become more obvious and of concern to residents. Managing development in a manner that is consistent with community values is of paramount importance to citizens. Sartell is located within the St. Cloud MSA and in 2000, the St. Cloud MSA was 167,392. The area is forecasted to have a continued strong

and steady growth rate so the need to preserve open space for a regional park in the immediate future is evident.

Total Project Cost

The total cost to acquire this property is \$3.1 million. The city of Sartell will use its half cent sales tax revenue, park dedication funding, and property tax to provide 50 percent of the project cost.

Project Contact Person

City of Sartell Anita Rasmussen, Planning and Community Development Director 125 Pine Cone Road North PO Box 140

Sartell, Minnesota 56377-0140
Phone: (320) 258-7306
Fax: (320) 253-3337
Email: anita@sartellmn.com

Priority 4: Warner Lake County Park Land Acquisition

This request is for \$410,000 in state funding to assist with the acquisition of 23 acres of land to expand a regional park. This property would provide an important buffer for one of the five public beaches in Stearns County. The proposed acquisition is one hundred yards from this busy public beach.

Warner Lake County Park is located adjacent to Interstate 94 and adjacent to rapidly developing areas of Stearns and Wright County. The acquisition of these 23 acres will help protect an important beautiful natural environment and popular lake.

Total Project Cost

The total cost to acquire this property is \$820,000. Stearns county will cover 50 percent of the project cost with county capital bonding funds.

Project Contact Person

Chuck Wocken, Park Director 1802 County Road 137 Waite Park, Minnesota 56387 Phone: (320) 255-6172

Phone: (320) 255-6172 Fax: (320) 255-6177

Email: chuck.wocken@co.stearns.mn.us

Priority 5: First Street North Area (162 acres)

This request is for land acquisition for parkland to meet the comprehensive plan goals adopted in 2003 addressing parks, recreation, and the environment. There are four properties of interest that have been identified through planning studies. The second priority is the First Street North property with a request for \$1.85 million in state funding for a regional park.

The First Street North area is for the purchase of 162 acres of land presently in LeSauk Township. The opportunity and need to acquire such property exists. First, community members have been in support of such a project. Secondly, a Natural Resources Inventory completed in 2006 has identified this area as having an important environmental forest. Wildlife spotted on the property include owls, wild turkeys, ducks, white tail deer, raccoons, squirrels, chipmunks, possums, skunks, coyote, and fox. Thirdly, an Athletic Field Location Study has identified this area as a prime location for a regional park serving Sartell residents, surrounding communities and visitors from beyond. The area would provide an array of active and passive regional recreational opportunities. The active portion would house athletic fields. shelter facilities, water fountains, restrooms, picnic facilities, and trails. The natural conservation component would complement the active recreational area. It would preserve the forest stand, while providing trails and scenic areas for the public to enjoy and utilize. This would include picnicking, bird and nature observation, hiking, snowshoeing, and more.

Sartell has an impressive history of comprehensive planning. There have been numerous planning studies undertaken in the past several years - some of which have centered on preserving the natural open space character of the city. In 1998, the city adopted the Parks and Trails Master Plan and in 2003 they adopted the Comprehensive Plan. More recently, in June 2006, St.

Cloud State University Survey Institute conducted a survey for the city of Sartell to assist the city in assessing the community's level of support for continuing the collection of the half-cent sales tax that has been in place since 2002. The sales tax that has been collected thus far has helped fund land acquisition, park development and upgrades. Survey findings indicated a high level of support for park and recreation amenities. In fact, 89 percent of residents rated funding for land acquisition for natural areas, open spaces and nature parks as important or very important. In 2005, the city of Sartell completed an Athletic Field Location Study in response to the comprehensive plan goals and strategies, which analyzed potential sites for a regional park that offered both active recreation facilities and passive nature areas. The First Street North area was one of the top areas chosen because of the close proximity to the growing portion of the city, trail connections exist along the easterly side of the site, and the potential athletic facilities location is flat, dry, and open.

Over the last 20 years, Sartell has seen considerable growth: Sartell's population increased 181 percent between 1980 and 2000. The development that has been occurring has put more pressure on the land resources. In 2007, with an estimated population of 14,000, growth pressure continues to mount and the city has actively attempted to manage it through various means with varying levels of success. As land becomes increasingly scarce, the visual and environmental impact of development has become more obvious and of concern to residents. Managing development in a manner that is consistent with community values is of paramount importance to citizens. Sartell is located within the St. Cloud MSA and in 2000, the St. Cloud MSA was 167,392. The area is forecasted to have a continued strong and steady growth rate so the need to preserve open space for a regional park in the immediate future is evident.

Total Project Cost

The total cost to acquire this property is \$3.7 million. The city of Sartell will use its half cent sales tax revenue, park dedication funding, and property tax to provide 50 percent of the project cost.

Project Contact Person

City of Sartell Anita Rasmussen, Planning and Community Development Director 125 Pine Cone Road North PO Box 140

Sartell, Minnesota 56377-0140 Phone: (320) 258-7306 Fax: (320) 253-3337

Email: anita@sartellmn.com

Priority 6: Bakers Lake Area (300 acres)

This request is for land acquisition for parkland to meet the comprehensive plan goals adopted in 2003 addressing parks, recreation, and the environment. There are four properties of interest that have been identified through planning studies. The fourth priority is the Bakers Lake area with a request for \$2.95 million in state funding for a regional park.

The Bakers Lake area is on the northerly edge of the city of Sartell presently located in LeSauk Township. The area would serve as a regional park and encompass 300 total acres with the potential in the future for an additional 77 acres for a total park area of 377 acres. The opportunity and need to acquire such property exists. First, community members have been in support of such a project. Secondly, a Natural Resources Inventory completed in 2006 has identified this area as having important environmental features, including upland vegetation, forest, and streams. Wildlife species spotted on the property include Sandhill Cranes, Piedbilled Grebes, several kinds of ducks, and Great Blue Herons. Located on the property is Bakers Lake, which is a natural environment lake. Vegetation on the property includes wetland grass, goldenrod, and bur oaks. Thirdly, an Athletic Field Location Study has identified the Bakers Lake area as a prime location for a Regional Park serving Sartell, surrounding communities and visitors from beyond. The area would provide an array of active and passive regional recreational opportunities. The active portion would house athletic fields, shelter facilities, and restrooms. The natural conservation component to the regional park would complement the active recreational area. It would preserve open space, wetlands and forests, while providing trails and scenic areas for the

public to enjoy and utilize. This would include picnicking, bird and nature observation, hiking, snowshoeing, and more.

Sartell has an impressive history of comprehensive planning. There have been numerous planning studies undertaken in the past several years - some of which have centered on preserving the natural open space character of the city. In 1998, the city adopted the Parks and Trails Master Plan and in 2003 they adopted the Comprehensive Plan. More recently, in June 2006, St. Cloud State University Survey Institute conducted a survey for the city of Sartell to assist the city in assessing the community's level of support for continuing the collection of the half-cent sales tax that has been in place since 2002. The sales tax that has been collected thus far has helped fund land acquisition, park development and upgrades. Survey findings indicated a high level of support for park and recreation amenities. In fact, 89 percent of residents rated funding for land acquisition for natural areas, open spaces and nature parks as important or very important. In 2005, the city of Sartell completed an Athletic Field Location Study in response to the comprehensive plan goals and strategies, which analyzed potential sites for a regional park that offered both active recreation facilities and passive nature areas. The Bakers Lake area was one of the top areas chosen.

Over the last 20 years, Sartell has seen considerable growth: Sartell's population increased 181 percent between 1980 and 2000. The development that has been occurring has put more pressure on the land resources. In 2007, with an estimated population of 14,000, growth pressure continues to mount and the city has actively attempted to manage it through various means with varying levels of success. As land becomes increasingly scarce, the visual and environmental impact of development has become more obvious and of concern to residents. Managing development in a manner that is consistent with community values is of paramount importance to citizens. Sartell is located within the St. Cloud MSA and in 2000, the St. Cloud MSA was 167,392. The area is forecasted to have a continued strong and steady growth rate so the need to preserve open space for a regional park in the immediate future is evident.

Central MN Parks & Trails: 7 Projects

Total Project Cost

The total cost to acquire this property is \$5.9 million. The city of Sartell will use its half cent sales tax revenue, park dedication funding, and property tax to provide 50 percent of the project cost.

Project Contact Person

City of Sartell
Anita Rasmussen, Planning and Community Development Director
125 Pine Cone Road North
PO Box 140
Sartell. Minnesota 56377-0140

Phone: (320) 258-7306 Fax: (320) 253-3337 Email: anita@sartellmn.com

Priority 7: River Bluffs Regional Park – Improvements

This request is for state funding to help provide design and construction of St. Cloud River Bluffs Regional Park; park entry, parking lot, trail head, entry kiosk, and development of active recreation areas. The improvements to be provided to the park are consistent with the master plan of the park completed in 2004. This park has local and regional significance and is adjacent to the Mississippi River. The majority of the park is within the Mississippi River Wild and Scenic River Corridor. It services the population of not only the city of St. Cloud, but also the cities and rural residents of the tricounty area of Benton, Stearns and Sherburne counties. The restoration and protection activities include prairie, oak savanna, wet meadows, and woodlands as well as park improvements that include service/public road access, parking, trails, signage, and a small open air observation shelter at a river overlook, picnic areas, playground, canoe launch and fishing pier.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this project is \$2 million. The city of St. Cloud will cover 50 percent of the project cost from city resources.

Project Contact Person

Scott D. Zlotnik, Park Director St. Cloud Park Department 400 Second Street South St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301 Phone: (320) 650-3170

Fax: (320) 255-7250

Email: scott.zlotnik@ci.stcloud.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Central MN Parks & Trails: 7 Projects

| To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 50% of total project cost for each project is to be provided frogovernment funds. Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mis Minnesota. The state assists with funding both metro and nor regional parks. These projects should be considered alongsic similar requests. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | ssion in n-metro de other |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 50% of total project cost for each project is to be provided fro government funds. Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mis Minnesota. The state assists with funding both metro and not regional parks. These projects should be considered alongsic similar requests. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | ssion in n-metro de other |
| government funds. 2. Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mis Minnesota. The state assists with funding both metro and not regional parks. These projects should be considered alongsic similar requests. 3. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | ssion in n-metro de other |
| Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mis Minnesota. The state assists with funding both metro and not regional parks. These projects should be considered alongsic similar requests. 3. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | n-metro de other |
| Minnesota. The state assists with funding both metro and nor regional parks. These projects should be considered alongsic similar requests. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | n-metro de other |
| regional parks. These projects should be considered alongsic similar requests. 3. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | de other |
| similar requests. 3. Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | nefit. |
| These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional ben 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | nefit. |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | nefit. |
| No. | |
| 1191 | |
| | |
| | |
| See #2 above. | |
| 6. Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | , |
| If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding fo | r sımılar |
| projects. | |
| 7. Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| Not significantly. 8. Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| or constructing and processing a | Cloud |
| Yes, the Sartell City Council, Stearns County Board, and St. City Council each adopted a resolution of support in June 20 | |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | 07. |
| requesting? | |
| Yes. | |
| 10. Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 mi | illion) |
| been submitted? | |
| No. Funds are primarily for land acquisition so predesign is | not |
| required for 6 of the 7 projects. For the remaining project, projects, proje | |
| funding is requested as part of the request for state funds. | J |

Chisholm: 6th Street SW/SE Road Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,300,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Chisholm)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Chisholm, in St. Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Chisholm is requesting \$1.3 million for the 6^{th} Street SW / SE Improvements project. This funding will be used for construction to complete the project.

Project Description

The city of Chisholm is requesting 1.3 million for the 6^{th} Street SW / SE Improvements project. This funding will be used for construction to complete the project.

The 6th Street SW portion of the project is a designated Municipal State Aid Street (MSAS) route planned for reconstruction in the next five years. With this road reconstruction, the city will need to replace the water and sewer infrastructure due to its age and poor condition. The 6th Street SE portion of the project is included to provide a seamless continuation of the utility infrastructure replacement. This portion of the project also includes construction of a new sanitary sewer lift station, interconnecting piping and discharge force main piping to replace an existing lift station. The purpose of the lift station replacement is to increase the pumping capacity to meet the needs of the St. Louis County Fairgrounds proposed sanitary sewer connection in this area.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$3.6 million. The amount of state funds requested is \$1.3 million. The city of Chisholm has eligible matching funds from its MSAS for a portion of the project for approximately \$1 million. (The city of Chisholm is the only current project financing source for the remaining project costs of \$2.6 million.)

Other Considerations

The city of Chisholm will own and operate the $6^{\rm th}$ Street SW / SE Improvements. Construction is to begin in May of 2009 and be completed by June of 2010.

Project Contact Person

The Honorable Michael Jugovich Mayor, City of Chisholm 316 West Lake Street Chisholm, Minnesota 55719

Phone: (218) 254-7900 Fax: (218) 254-7955

Email: mayor@ci.chisholm.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Chisholm: 6th Street SW/SE Road Improvements

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 64% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation and economic development are is an important state |
| | mission. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors |
| | are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Chisholm City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 12, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |
| | · |

Clearbrook: Community Center Roof Renovation

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$153,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Clearbrook)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Clearbrook, in Clearwater County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$153,000 in state funding to renovate and repair the city's portion of the roof of the Community Center in Clearbrook.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$153,000 in state funding to renovate and repair the city's portion of the roof of the Community Center in Clearbrook. Currently the roof leaks and damage has been done to several interior parts of our building.

This project has an impact that is local, as well as regional. The building was once the Clearbrook-Gonvick School. When the school relocated to a new building, this building was left vacant. Five parties, including the city offices, each purchased and deeded off separate sections of the building. Each of the five parties then renovated and put to different uses their section of the building. News of the impact of our renovation was featured in many papers, including the *Fargo Forum*. People, including many Clearbrook-Gonvick alumni, throughout the state as well as North Dakota have traveled to our community in order to see what improvements have been made to this former school. The revenue brought into our community and county from people who travel here for this purpose has had a great impact on our community, as well as the surrounding communities in this region.

In addition, community events such as fundraisers, weddings, graduations and youth gatherings are held here on a regular basis in our Community Center. Often several such events are held here during a month. We are also

used as a meeting site for Clearwater County, Clearwater Soil and Water, and Clearwater County Red Lake Watershed.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the roofing project for the city government's section of the building is \$153,000. The city would use its own resources to pay for any interior repairs that may be needed.

Other Considerations

The city of Clearbrook owns and operates the building. It is our hope that if the city receives \$153,000 for this project, we will be able to complete the roof renovation of our portion of the building in an effort to keep this very important and vital piece of property operating in our community.

The project is scheduled to be undertaken and completed in May 2008.

Project Contact Person

Lisa Amundson P.O. Box 62 Clearbrook, Minnesota 56634 Phone: (218)-776-3213

Fax: (218)-776-3217 Email: cityclbk@gvtel.com

Governor's Recommendations

Clearbrook: Community Center Roof Renovation

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state role in funding community center style projects is unclear |
| | and has varied considerably from one biennium to another. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | No resolution submitted. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |

Clear Lake: Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,725,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Clear Lake)

PROJECT LOCATION: Cities of Clear Lake & Clearwater - Sherburne Cnty

Project At A Glance

 \$4.725 million for a regional wastewater treatment facility, serving the cities of Clear Lake and Clearwater in central Minnesota

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$4.725 million in state bond funding for a regional wastewater treatment facility that serves the cities of Clear Lake and Clearwater in central Minnesota. The facility is located in Sherburne County and currently is designed to provide wastewater treatment for both cities combined population of just under 2,000 people. Because loading capacity at the existing plant has reached the maximum amount allowed by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), we can no longer issue building permits in our cities until interim treatment is in place and phase I of the long range plan is constructed.

The interim treatment will cost \$1.1 million and will only provide enough treatment to allow us to bring our current level of discharge into compliance with state regulations. Because our treatment facility is aerated ponds, we cannot maintain treatment levels necessary for compliance during the colder winter months.

We are very small communities with limited resources and small tax bases. As standards for wastewater treatment becomes more stringent, our ability to meet those standards with the resources we have available to us becomes extraordinarily difficult. Many of our residents are older with fixed incomes

and raising taxes to pay for this expansion would create a severe hardship for many of them.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$4.725 million.

Other Considerations

Our wastewater discharge is into the Mississippi River and because it is in a portion of the river that has been designated as an outstanding water resource, we have frozen limits on the discharge, which grossly inhibits our ability to maintain compliance. The environmental impact can be limited by using some of the best technology available to do the expansion. This technology comes at a high cost for all our residents but the benefits of cleaner water for every other community that draws its drinking water from the Mississippi River is undeniable.

We are committed to building a safe, efficient and cost effective plant however; we recognize that we will need financial assistance to achieve this goal. Communities such as ours have to be able to grow and attract commercial and business to our area or we will stagnate and decline as some other rural communities have done.

Project Contact Person

Marilyn Bujalski
City Clerk, City of Clear Lake and Boardmember, Clear Lake / Clearwater
Joint Sewer Authority
City of Lear Lake
PO Box 298
Clear Lake, Minnesota 55319

Phone: (320) 743-3111 Fax: (320) 743-4307

Email: cityofclearlake@frontier.net

Governor's Recommendations

Clear Lake: Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| ١. | 100% of project costs are to be provided from state funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| ۷. | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | |
| Э. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| _ | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Not yet received. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Cold Spring: Downtown Riverfront Redevelopment

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,117,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Cold Spring)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Cold Spring, in Stearns County

Project At A Glance

The city of Cold Spring requests \$2,117,500 in state funding to redevelop its downtown riverfront.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2,117,500 in state funding to acquire land, pre-design, design, construct and (to some extent) furnish several public facilities located in downtown Cold Spring. There is a very large industrial site (30 acres in size) that has been vacated by the Cold Spring Granite Company, located in the heart of Cold Spring's downtown. City officials are working with company owners to develop a plan for the removal of that blight, and construction of new riverfront development consisting of retail and office. This project includes the following elements.

- Enlarged docking facilities at Lion's Park The docking facilities at Lion's Park will be expanded to enable people from throughout the Sauk River Chain of Lakes to have access by boat to services in downtown Cold Spring.
- Pedestrian Traffic Control Light This light system was a suggestion by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) as a way to provide pedestrians with a safe way to cross Highway 23 when walking on the riverfront.
- Cold Spring Community Center To date, a total of \$82,522 has been raised to establish a community center that is expected to house the Cold Spring public library (a branch in the GRRL system), the Cold

- Spring History Museum and the senior center, along with public meeting rooms and other public facilities.
- Riverfront Promenade Currently the public has limited access to the Sauk River. A promenade is proposed immediately adjacent to the Sauk River, and will stretch for about one mile, connecting Lions Park to Frogtown Park. Currently the entire shoreline between the two parks is private property. The spillway below the Cold Spring dam is a favorite location for fishing and photography. An important link for this project is the construction of a pedestrian bridge spanning Brewery Creek, connecting Frogtown Park with Lions Park.
- Regional Trail Head Park Up to 12 feet of fill would be removed from the opalescent granite quarry (abandoned and filled in the 1980s), and converted into a public park. This will serve as a regional trailhead for the Rocori Trail, and will be adjacent to the community center.
- Regional Trail Head Shelter A shelter will be constructed in the trailhead park for those utilizing the Rocori Trail.
- Canoe Portage at State Owned Park Presently the use of the Sauk River by individuals desiring to canoe the river requires an exit of the river at Lion's Park and carrying the canoe approximately 12 city blocks. The portage route requires crossing Highway 23, Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad tracks and Main Street in downtown Cold Spring. It is proposed that a new portage route be created allowing individuals to exit the river at the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) operated boat landing, travel one block along Mill Street and reenter the river below the dam.

The success of the proposed project will determine whether this property will become blight for the community that impedes further commercial growth, or whether it becomes an unprecedented opportunity for progressive growth of the central Minnesota region. Virtually all of the smaller communities that exist in the shadows of the St. Cloud metropolitan area suffer a loss of commercial activity to this larger retail hub. They find difficulty in attracting new business opportunities, as businesses are drawn to the labor pool and support services that are offered in the larger community. The city's ultimate mission for this project is to ensure the sustainability and viability of the community and to maximize community assets."

Cold Spring: Downtown Riverfront Redevelopment

Cold Spring is at the beginning of the "Horseshoe Chain of Lakes," a system of 12 lakes connected by the Sauk River, and home to thousands of permanent residents and visitors recreating on the lakes. Hundreds of small, independent business in the small communities near the Horseshoe Chain of Lakes are dependant upon this resort traffic; and keeping these resorts occupied requires public amenities and retail businesses. Even the industry in the central Minnesota region is oriented to the resort tourism here.

The most significant statewide impact is the tourism amenity that this project will add for Minnesota. In pursuit of this objective, Cold Spring will help fulfill the mission of the Explore Minnesota Tourism, which is to promote and facilitate travel to and within the state of Minnesota. This increased tourism leverages the state's tourism investment with increased involvement by the private sector. The Cold Spring Area Chamber of Commerce estimates that there are already more than 100 tour buses alone that have Cold Spring as their destination. The Chamber also estimates that there are thousands of visitors to the area that travel to see many of these same sights. There are several sites that are most commonly visited; Assumption Chapel, Gluek Brewing Company and the renowned Cold Spring Bakery. All the amenities in the project proposed in this request are expected to greatly enhance the tourism opportunities for this region.

The second objective is the promotion of economic development. The project not only provides for the clean up of a blighted property, but also will increase the commercial opportunities for both business owners and consumers for the central Minnesota region. In so doing, Cold Spring will help fulfill the mission of the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development, which is to support the economic success of individuals, businesses, and communities by improving opportunities for growth.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$4.235 million. The city of Cold Spring will contribute at least 50 percent towards the cost of this project.

Other Considerations

Most of the facilities will be owned and operated by the city of Cold Spring. The city will share a small part of ownership responsibility for facilities such as the crosswalk lights with other governmental entities.

Construction is expected to begin in August 2008 and end in April 2010.

Project Contact Person

Larry Lahr, City Administrator City of Cold Spring 27 Red River Avenue South Cold Spring, Minnesota 56320-2536

Phone: (320) 685-3653 Fax: (320)685-8551

Email: LLahr@ColdSpring.govoffice.com

Governor's Recommendations

Cold Spring: Downtown Riverfront Redevelopment

| Evaluation of Local Projects |
|---|
| To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission in |
| Minnesota. However, the degree to which local projects should be |
| funded, as contrasted with state projects, is unclear. |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| No. |
| Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| The degree to which local projects should be funded, as contrasted |
| with state projects, is unclear. |
| Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| projects. |
| Does project compete with other facilities? |
| Not significantly. |
| Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| Yes, the Cold Spring City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| June 12, 2007. |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| requesting? |
| N/A |
| Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| been submitted? |
| Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| |

Coleraine: Downtown Redevelopment, Street Reconstr.

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$860,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Coleraine)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Coleraine, in Itasca County

Project At A Glance

The city of Coleraine requests \$860,000 in state funding to assist with the redevelopment of its downtown corridor.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$860,000 in state funding to assist the city of Coleraine with the redevelopment of the communities downtown corridor. The city of Coleraine has identified a need to revitalize the downtown central business district.

Local Significance:

Downtowns are the economic hub of a city's viability in providing goods and services to residents of the community. The redevelopment of the Coleraine downtown core will generate private sector investment, and improve the economic viability of the downtown businesses.

Regional Significance:

Redevelopment of a community's downtown has demonstrated that the economic benefits of the improvements have generated regional economic development in the form of increased tax base and new job creation. In the case of Coleraine, and its proximity to the extensive tourist industry in northeast Minnesota, the opportunity to capture the economic benefit of tourism will increase.

State significance:

The increase in economic activity in Minnesota as a result of the public/private investments to redeveloping downtowns, meets state goals related to increasing economic development opportunities and the creation of healthy and sustainable communities.

Total Project Cost

The total project cost is \$1.72 million. The city of Coleraine will provide \$860,000 of the total project cost.

Other Considerations

Construction is expected to begin in October 2008 and end in October 2009. The city of Coleraine will own and operate the facilities.

Project Contact Person

Sandy Bluntach City of Coleraine 302 Roosevelt Street Coleraine, Minnesota. 55722 Phone: (218) 245-2112

Fax: (218) 245-2123 Email: Colerain@lcp2.net

Governor's Recommendations

Coleraine: Downtown Redevelopment, Street Reconstr.

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | No. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | No. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Coleraine City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 18, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| | |

Columbia Heights: 49th Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,672,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Columbia Heights)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Columbia Heights, in Anoka County

Project At A Glance

The city of Columbia Heights requests \$1.662 million in state funding for an ADA-compliant pedestrian and bicycle bridge.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1.672 million in state funding to acquire land, predesign, design, and construct a new pedestrian and bicycle bridge for the purpose of providing an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant facility that offers safe access to destinations within the city of Columbia Heights (including schools, parks, retail centers) as well as connecting to regional destinations such as the metro transit Hub on Central Avenue and existing and planned bike and pedestrian facilities providing direct access to downtown Minneapolis, regional parks, and regional retail destinations such as Rosedale Mall. The bridge would be constructed in the city of Columbia Heights in Anoka County.

This structure would replace an existing pedestrian / bicycle bridge over Central Avenue Northeast at 49th Avenue Northeast. The existing bridge is a concrete structure built in 1970 that is not ADA compliant. The concrete steps require ongoing maintenance to repair chipping and erosion. The bridge is often not accessible at all in the winter, due to ice and snow pack. The bridge steps do include a steel "rail" to accommodate a rolling bicycle, but it is very difficult for many people including most children to maneuver their bikes within the rail as they walk it up or down the steps. Pedestrians with limited mobility must cross the busy, 4-lane TH 65 at grade, which is

unsafe because there is presently no pedestrian crossing facility at grade at this location.

Central Avenue is a principal transit corridor serving the Central Avenue retail corridor through Columbia Heights and into the city of Minneapolis, and also serving the Minneapolis downtown business district. There is a nearby Metro Transit "Transit Center" at Central Avenue and 40th Avenue Northeast. The new ADA compliant pedestrian bridge will provide direct access by bus to the Metro Transit Hub, including direct access to Routes 10, 11, 809, and 821 which serve Central Avenue, Rosedale, and downtown Minneapolis. (The Minneapolis Central Business District is just a mile or so from the city's south border, and Rosedale Center is just a couple miles from the city's east border.)

The reconstructed pedestrian/ bike bridge will provide direct access and access to transit to many key employment centers. Columbia Heights principal employers are Medtronic (an R&D facility is located within the city, and corporate headquarters is located just outside the city limits in Fridley) with hundreds of employees. An industrial district employing a significant number of workers is also located just outside the city's west border in Fridley. In addition, the bridge would provide access to bicyclists and pedestrians to a multitude of existing recreational facilities including 14 city parks, (largest is 28 acre Huset Park); Silverwood Park at Silver Lake (Three Rivers Park District), access to key regional trails (St. Anthony Parkway, Mississippi River Corridor, Grand Rounds; and the planned Northeast Diagonal Regional Trail and Twin Lakes Regional Trail. The proposed ADA compliant bike / pedestrian bridge will be a key component of the planned city wide trail network providing access to these facilities.

The new bridge would be constructed with ADA compliant ramps and decking that would meet all state design standards.

Total Project Cost

The total project cost is \$3.345 million. The city of Columbia Heights will contribute local funds and solicit additional local and federal funding for the remaining 50 percent of the project.

Columbia Heights: 49th Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The bridge crosses Central Avenue (TH65) in Columbia Heights and is owned by the Minnesota Department of Transportation. Mn/DOT will be responsible for maintaining the bridge.

Other Considerations

Construction is expected to begin in June 2010 and end in December 2010.

Project Contact Person

Kevin Hansen, P.E.. Director of Public Works, City Engineer City of Columbia Heights 637 38th Avenue Northeast Columbia Heights, Minnesota 55421

Office: (763) 706-3705 Fax: (763) 706-3701 Cell: (612) 719-9910

Email: Kevin.hansen@ci.columbia-heights.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Columbia Heights: 49th Avenue Pedestrian Bridge

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation is an important state mission. In the metropolitan area |
| | the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are responsible for |
| | transportation planning and programming and prioritizing state |
| | funding for transportation projects. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Columbia Heights City Council adopted a resolution of |
| | support on April 9, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| 40 | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? |
| | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |

Cottage Grove: Gateway Corridor Enhancement Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Cottage Grove)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Cottage Grove, in Washington County

Project At A Glance

The city of Cottage Grove requests \$1 million in 2008, and a total of \$2.5 million over the period from 2008 -- 2012, in state funding for improvements to the Cottage Grove Gateway Corridor.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for a total of \$2.5 million in state funding, to complete predesign, design and construction of planned improvements in the Cottage Grove Gateway Corridor which consists of all publicly owned areas adjacent to and within one half mile to the north and south sides of State Trunk Highway 10 and 61 between the 70th Street overpass, and Jamaica Avenue underpass.

The Cottage Grove Gateway Corridor serves as the gateway to the city, the Region and the State. The project will benefit the region and state by serving the portions of the population who utilize the State Highway 10 and 61 transportation corridor. By the year 2020 over 25 million vehicles per year will pass through the Cottage Grove Gateway Corridor. When vehicle occupant estimates are factored in, the impacts and benefits from the Gateway Corridor improvements completed in conjunction with a successful State Capital Bonding request are significant.

The major regional transportation construction project occurring in the city of Newport have greatly improved transportation options and travel times for the area, but has negatively affected the image of Cottage Grove and the region. The transportation project has created an expansive amount of concrete and associated hardscape in the area. In order to remedy the situation, the city of Cottage Grove has identified the need to enhance the vistas and current open space amenities along the Cottage Grove Gateway Corridor.

The planned improvements would create a coordinated soft transition between the extensive roadway hardscape and the natural environment. Regionally the environment would benefit through additional surface water management enhancements. In addition, the project would also consolidate 204 acres of park and open space as a regional amenity operated and managed by a local community.

The plans for the enhancement include the creation of a scenic overlook, picnic shelters, landscaping, pedestrian bridge, trailways, interpretive signage, information signage, ornamental fencing, banners, safety lighting, decorative, park and open space improvements, exotic specie management and major surface water management improvements. A formal study has been completed to gather predesign information on the enhancement project which is planned for completion between 2008 and 2012.

A successful funding request will increase the city's ability to enhance the Gateway Corridor which serves to enhance existing state investments to the benefit of commuters, bus and rail transit users, and state and regional tourism.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$5 million: \$2 million in 2008, \$1.5 million in 2010 and \$1.5 million in 2012. Of the total, Cottage Grove will provide 50 percent from non-state sources.

Other Considerations

The city of Cottage Grove will own and operate the facilities. Construction is expected to last from July 2008 to November 2012.

Cottage Grove: Gateway Corridor Enhancement Project

Project Contact Person

John M. Burbank, AICP Senior Planner City of Cottage Grove

Phone: (651) 458-2825 Fax: (651) 458-2881

E-mail: jburbank@cottage-grove.org

Governor's Recommendations

Cottage Grove: Gateway Corridor Enhancement Project

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs will be provided from non-state sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing recreational opportunities via trails is an important state |
| | mission in Minnesota. The state has existing grant programs to |
| | provide financial assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | yes, the Cottage Grove City Council adopted a resolution of support |
| | on June 20, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for this type of project. |
| | · |

Crookston: Flood Control - Ice Arena Relocation

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$12,889,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Crookston)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Crookston, in Polk County

Project At A Glance

The city of Crookston requests \$12,888,624 in state funding to construct a replacement ice arena complex. The current arena must to relocated in order to accommodate a planned flood control project in 2010.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$12,888,624 in state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new ice arena complex to replace an existing facility that is being relocated in order to accommodate a planned flood control project in 2010 within Polk County and the city of Crookston.

More specifically, a 12-foot dike will be constructed through the present location of our Depression era arena with its early 1970's annex. Beyond the flood control objectives, the project allows for the replacement of this complex, which has by far exceeded its design life and is functionally obsolete.

Our concept envisions a complex housing and event facility capable of accommodating up to 1,500 spectators, and would include two practice sheets of ice. Our youth hockey program; youth figure skating program; the Crookston High School Boy's Varsity and Junior Varsity Hockey teams, and the Crookston High School Girls Varsity and Junior Varsity Hockey teams will be primary users of the complex. The new facility will remain the Home of the University of Minnesota-Crookston Golden Eagles Men's Hockey program.

Several significant policy objectives will be accomplished and addressed with the funding and successful completion of the project:

First and foremost, allowing for the construction of the dike through the current facility will provide flood protection to a neighborhood in Crookston and ensure the preservation of 162 homes and businesses. Based on the county's estimate of assessed valuation, the average home value in the neighborhood is \$42,900. Relocating this facility and providing effective flood control protection will ensure that an important part of the region's affordable housing stock is preserved.

Second, providing strong state funding support for this project builds on the core principles valued in the continuation of a strong state-local fiscal partnership. Aside from accomplishing the aforementioned policy objectives, this project presents the opportunity to provide equity in the facilities and services offered from community to community. Having the second lowest tax base per capita in the state of Minnesota for communities over 2,500 residents, conventional local financing methods are not a viable option for this project. Nonetheless, the need remains the same.

Finally, the project has regional and statewide significance. As home ice for the University of Minnesota-Crookston Golden Eagle Hockey Program, the facility supports an important part of the University of Minnesota-Crookston's Division II athletic program. Additional locker rooms and related support facilities have been incorporated into the design in order to accommodate the needs of the program.

In addition to supporting an important state institution, approximately 20 percent of the program participants in the 2006-2007 program year did not live in the city of Crookston, demonstrating that the programs attract participants from a broader area.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$14,609,449. The city of Crookston will contribute \$1,720,825 to the project,

Crookston: Flood Control - Ice Arena Relocation

Other Considerations

The city of Crookston will own and operate the facility. Construction of the project is expected to begin May 2009 and end August 2010.

Project Contact Person

Aaron Parrish, City Administrator City of Crookston 124 North Broadway Crookston, Minnesota 56716

Phone: (218) 281-1232 Fax: (218) 281-5609

Email: aparrish@crookston.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Crookston: Flood Control - Ice Arena Relocation

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 12% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Floodwater control is an important state mission. The state has an |
| | existing grant program to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| | This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes. The Crookston City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 12, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | The city expected to submit a project predesign by the end of August. |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$88,520,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Dakota County)

PROJECT LOCATION: various locations in Dakota County

Project At A Glance

Dakota County requests state funding assistance for seven projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$22 million to continue the development of the Cedar Avenue Transitway
- ♦ \$6.65 million to complete design and construct a Public Safety and Technology Support Center in Empire Township
- \$25 million to reconstruct the interchange of U.S. Highway 52 and County Road 42 in Rosemount
- ♦ \$6 million for the Alternatives Analysis and Draft EIS for the Robert Street Corridor
- ♦ \$5.35 million to construct frontage road access at U.S. Highway 52 in Inver Grove Heights
- \$22.12 million to construct an interchange at TH 13 and County Road 5 in Burnsville
- ♦ \$1.5 million to construct a pedestrian bridge over the Cannon River in Lake Byllesby Regional Park

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Cedar Avenue Transitway, Phase I

This request in the amount of \$22 million is for continued predesign, environmental documentation, and station development to support the Cedar Avenue Transitway, a tier one transitway identified in the Metropolitan Council's 2020 Master Transit Plan. The Cedar Avenue Transitway project will involve development of Bus Rapid Transit in the Cedar Avenue Corridor

south from the Mall of America in the city of Bloomington (Hennepin County) to the city of Lakeville (Dakota County). The Cedar Avenue Transitway is a key to maintaining mobility in Dakota County and maintaining commuting times at acceptable levels.

With the support of the legislature, preliminary environmental studies and development of a short-term improvement program for the project are proceeding.

This \$22 million request will address cost increases from the 2003 implementation plan and will also advance station work identified in phase II.

Priority 1 Total Cost: The total cost of the 2008 phase of this multi-year project is \$38.8 million. In addition to the state funding, the project will also utilize \$13.3 million in federal funds and \$3.5 million in funds from the Dakota County Regional Rail Authority that have been secured or an earlier phase of the project.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This Phase 1 project has received a total of \$15 million in state bonding: \$10 million in 2005 and \$5 million in 2006.

Other Considerations

The project has received \$13.3 million of federal funds and \$3.5 million of Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority funds for prior years.

Dakota County and the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Dan Krom, Transit Manager Dakota County Western Service Center 14955 Galaxie Avenue Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124

Phone: (952) 891-7146 Fax: (952) 891-7031

Email: daniel.krom@co.dakota.mn.us

Priority 2: Public Safety Technology and Support Center

This request is for \$6.65 million in state funding to complete pre-design and design requirements and construct a new Public Safety Technology and Support Center in Dakota County to create greater efficiency, higher cost-effectiveness, and enhanced services through shared public safety technology, regional training and coordination in the use of public safety technology, and logistical support for public safety operations.

The Dakota Public Safety Technology and Support Center (PSTSC) in Dakota County is designed to be a center for coordinated services, partnerships, and training that will function to enhance the public safety and security of the citizens of Dakota County and the region. In addition to providing a central location for key services for law enforcement serving Dakota County and its cities, information sharing through advanced technology will be at the core of the provision of services to create critical linkages among law enforcement agencies in the region. The proposed project is one result of the High Performance Partnership project, an ongoing analysis by the 11 major cities in Dakota County and Dakota County government of ways that local governments can work in partnership to better provide services in Dakota County. It builds on the successful development of the multi-jurisdictional Dakota Communications Center (DCC), which has combined six Public Safety Answering Points into one center that became operational in late 2007. (The PSTSC will be located on the same site as the DCC.)

The proposed project will result in the construction of an approximately 43,300 square foot facility on the northeast corner of the Empire Transportation Facility property owned by Dakota County. As currently envisioned, the primary components of the proposed project are:

- Approximately 1,300 square feet of space for the County's Criminal Justice Information Integration Network (CJIIN) and support services for the 800 MHz communications system used by law enforcement agencies in Dakota County and the regional communication system.
- Approximately 1,300 square feet of space for a computer forensics laboratory designed to assist law enforcement in dealing with white-collar crime, envisioned as a regional (or, statewide) resource.

- Approximately 2,800 square feet of training and classroom space for use in cooperative programs, such as space for a potential joint training initiative with the Metropolitan Emergency Services Board (MESB).
- ♦ Approximately 4,450 square feet of space for the Drug Task Force, including office space and garage/vestibule space.
- Approximately 18,000 square feet of space for the Parks, Trails, and Waterways section of the Dakota County Sheriff's Department and the Dakota County SWAT team.
- ◆ Approximately 5,500 additional square feet of common and general office space.

Remaining space in the facility includes the allowances for common staff and building areas, circulation space (20 percent allowance), a construction contingency, and other construction space factors. Dakota County continues to search for partnerships and projects that will expand coordination of law enforcement in the region (e.g., the Department of Public Safety) through application of technology, training and support for public safety technology, and improve regional sharing of information to enhance pubic safety in the Dakota county and region.

The Public Safety Technology and Support Center will house the information technology staff and infrastructure dedicated to a regional approach to upgrade, consolidate, implement, and support advanced technical solutions for law enforcement. Dakota County has served as a pilot county for development of new applications for sharing criminal justice information among local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies and for improved methods of sharing information between local law enforcement agencies and the state of Minnesota. A criminal justice integration hub for law enforcement and criminal justice systems — a key outcome of the pilot project — will facilitate electronic access to information by law enforcement agencies, courts, community corrections, the county attorney's office, and others. It will facilitate the deployment of applications for faster and better sharing of information between local law enforcement agencies and the state of Minnesota.

The PSTSC will provide a direct interface with the 800 MHz communication system in the region, as well as with the CriMNet and other regional systems. The Center will derive synergies from its co-location with the new DCC and with the county's fleet management center. It is being planned as a resource

for use by the MESB and as a potential regional resource for computer forensics.

Priority 2 Total Cost: The total cost of the PSTSC project is \$13.3 million. Dakota County will contribute 50 percent of the project cost.

Other Considerations

The PSTSC will be located in Empire Township in Dakota County. Dakota County will own and operate the facility. Construction will begin in October 2008 and will be completed by June 2010.

Project Contact Person

Jack Ditmore, Director Operations, Management, and Budget Dakota County Administration Center 1590 Highway 55 Hastings, Minnesota 55033

Phone: (651) 438-4432 Fax: (651) 438-4405

Email: jack.ditmore@co.dakota.mn.us

Priority 3: Interchange of US Highway 52 and County State Aid Highway 42

This request is for \$25 million in state funding for the reconstruction of the interchange of US Highway 52 and County State Aid Highway 42 in Rosemount, Minnesota.

Interchanges are the nodes that interconnect the most important, heavily traveled principal and minor arterial segments of the transportation system. As traffic volumes increase, the need for an interchange or the reconstruction of an existing interchange to provide safe and efficient operation of opposing traffic grows in importance. The existing underpass at the interchange is limited to one lane in each direction. This creates safety and capacity concerns for the interchange that require correction to accommodate projected traffic volumes at the interchange.

Trunk Highway 52 is the major connection between major points in southeastern Minnesota (e.g., the city of Rochester) and the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Rosemount is one of the most rapidly developing cities in Dakota County and the metropolitan region, expected to grow by 145 percent from 2000 to 2030. There is the strong potential for major commercial and industrial development near the interchange, with the potential for the Rosemount air cargo facility.

Priority 3 Total Cost: The total project cost is \$38.5 million. At least 20 percent local funding is anticipated. \$3.25 million of federal funds are available for right-of-way acquisition.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The Minnesota Department of Transportation has spent \$197,000 on preliminary engineering and environmental documentation for the project.

Other Considerations

\$378,000 of local funds have also been spent to date for engineering.

The Minnesota Department of Transportation will own and operate the facility. Land acquisition will begin as early as July 2008. Construction could begin as early as April 2010.

Project Contact Person

Mark Krebsbach
Dakota County Engineer/Transportation Director
Dakota County Western Service Center
14955 Galaxie Avenue
Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124
Phone: (952) 891-7102)

Fax: (952) 891-7031)

Email: mark.krebsbach@co.dakota.mn.us

Priority 4: Robert Street Corridor Transitway

This request is for \$6 million, of which \$2 million would be used for an FTA compliant alternatives analysis and draft environmental impact statement, the next steps in project development.

Based on the feasibility study recommendations, the \$4 million would be used for several base level improvement options to support enhanced bus service connecting major generators with "branded" vehicles along Robert Street; a pilot transit/express commuter bus project along the TH 55/TH 52 corridor; and development of a "signature" park-and-ride lot/station in the Inver Grove Heights/West St. Paul area.

The project will address increasing transportation impacts to the communities in the corridor study area and the transportation needs of the regional commuter travel shed to the south, including Cannon Falls, Northfield and Rochester.

Priority 4 Total Cost: The total cost of this project is not known at this time.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$500,000 for feasibility study work was funded by the 2006 legislature

Other Considerations

A project timeline has not been determined. It is also not known who will own and operate the facility.

Priority 5: Construction of frontage road on the east and west side of US Highway 52 in the city of Inver Grove Heights, Dakota County.

This request is for \$5.25 million in state funding to convert the section of Highway 52 from 111th Street to Concord Boulevard/ County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 56 in Inver Grove Heights into a limited-access freeway by providing a frontage road system so all existing accesses can be removed from the main roadway.

All of the current accesses onto Highway 52 through this segment will be consolidated to Concord Boulevard and/or 117th Street interchanges. According to the 2002 Highway 52 Interregional Corridor Study Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) conducted with community support, this segment ranks high for access closures, with several intersections in the top 25 priority intersections, based on crash/volume criteria along the high priority interregional corridor.

Priority 5 Total Cost: The total cost of the project is \$10.15 million. Non-state funds available for the other 50% of project costs have not yet been identified.

Other Considerations

The city of Inver Grove Heights will own and operate the frontage roads. Land acquisition could begin as early as July 2008. Construction could begin as early as June 2009

Project Contact Person

Mark Krebsbach Dakota County Engineer/Transportation Director Dakota County Western Service Center 14955 Galaxie Avenue Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124

Phone: (952) 891-7102 Fax: (952) 891-7031

Email: mark.krebsbach@co.dakota.mn.us

Priority 6: Construction of an interchange at the intersection of Trunk Highway 13 and County State Aid Highway 5 in the city of Burnsville.

This request is for \$22.12 million in state funding for construction of an interchange at TH 13 and CSAH 5 in Burnsville, Minnesota. Interchanges are the nodes that interconnect the most important, heavily traveled principal and minor arterial segments of the transportation system. As traffic volumes increase, the need for interchanges to provide safe and efficient operation of opposing traffic grows in importance. This intersection currently experiences

heavy levels of congestion during peak periods and has a higher number of crashes than would be expected.

This segment of TH 13 is part of the east/west principal arterial route connecting TH 169, I-35W and I-35E in the southern metropolitan area. In 2000, MnDOT, Dakota and Scott Counties, and the cities of Savage and Burnsville completed a study of the TH 13 corridor. The study recommended that an interchange be installed at the intersection of CSAH 5 and identified it as the top priority for improvements along the corridor.

TH 13 also plays a large role in serving the needs of critical freight movements in the area, in that highway access to the Ports of Savage is exclusively provided by TH 13. The Ports of Savage are a nationally prominent point for the shipment of grain and other commodities from Minnesota to the rest of the world. On an annual basis, the Ports of Savage handle at least 5 percent of the total United States' grain traffic. Related to this, TH 13 also carries the highest percentage of truck traffic in the metro area.

Priority 6 Total Cost: The total project cost is \$25 million. \$2.4 million in federal funds is available to the city of Burnsville for design and right-of-way acquisition; \$480,000 in local funds will be spent to provide for the 20 percent match of these federal funds.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes

None.

Other Considerations

\$200,000 of local funds have been spent to date for engineering. Mn/DOT will own and operate the facility. Construction could begin as early as April 2010.

Project Contact Person

Mark Krebsbach
Dakota County Engineer/Transportation Director
14955 Galaxie Ave
Apple Valley Minnesota 55124

Phone: (952) 891-7102 Fax: (952) 891-7031

Email: mark.krebsbach@co.dakota.mn.us

Priority 7: Cannon River Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, Lake Byllesby Regional Park

\$1.5 million is requested to construct a pedestrian bridge over the Cannon River at Lake Byllesby Regional Park. The bridge would provide a key river crossing for the Mill Towns State Trail for uses such as hiking, biking, rollerblading, and other uses.

The trail bridge will cross the Cannon River to connect Lake Byllesby Regional Park in Dakota County on the north side of the river and Lake Byllesby County Park in Goodhue County on the south side. A bridge crossing below the Lake Byllesby dam has been identified in Goodhue County's park master plan, the Dakota County Park Master Plan, and the Mill Towns State Trail Draft Master Plan.

The Mill Towns State Trail will connect the Sakatah Singing Hills Trail and the Cannon Valley Trail. It will be approximately 25 miles in length, connecting the towns of Cannon Falls, Randolph, Waterford, Northfield, Dundas, and Fairbault. The trail will pass through Goodhue, Dakota, and Rice Counties. The proposed bridge will become a key component of the trail system.

The proposal is based on a partnership among the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Goodhue County, and Dakota County.

Priority 7 Total Cost: The total project cost is \$1.5 million.

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Narrative

Dakota County: Seven Projects

Other Considerations

Dakota County will own and operate the bridge.

Project Contact Person

Steve Sullivan, Director Parks Department Dakota County Western Service Center 14955 Galaxie Avenue Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124

Phone: (952) 891-7088 Fax: (952) 891-7031

Email: steve.sullivan@co.dakota.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

Dakota County: Seven Projects

Evaluation of Local Projects

- To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed?
 Priority 1: 43% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. This is a multiphase project.
 - Priority 2: Public Safety Technology and Support Center: 50% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. Priority 3: 35% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funds.
 - Priority 4: No non-state funds are identified in the project request information.
 - Priority 5: 48% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funds.
 - Priority 6: 12% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funds
 - Priority 7: No non-state funds are identified in the project request information.
- Does project help fulfill an important state mission?
 Priority 1, 3-6: Transportation is an important state mission. In the
 metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are
 responsible for transportation planning and programming and
 prioritizing state funding for transportation projects.
 - Priority 2: Providing public safety facilities is an important state mission in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear.
 - Priority 7: Transportation and trail development are important state missions. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are responsible for transportation planning and programming and prioritizing state funding for transportation projects. The state has existing grant programs to provide financial assistance for trails.
- 3. Is project of regional or statewide significance?
 Priority 1, 3, 6: These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional benefit.
 - Priority 2, 4, 5, 7: These projects are viewed as having primarily a local benefit.
- Are new or additional state operating subsidies required?
 Priority 1: Additional operating costs are likely with increased transit service.

Priority 2-3, 5-7: No.

Priority 4: Request includes \$4 million of operating costs for bus service that would not be bondable. Ultimate transit service in the corridor would likely have operating costs.

| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. |
|-----|---|
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? Priority 1, 3-6: These projects should be considered alongside the other highway and transit plans and projects that are under discussion for the metropolitan area. Priority 2: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. Priority 7: This project should be considered alongside the other transportation and trail projects that are under discussion for the metropolitan area. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Dakota County Board adopted a resolution of support on June 19, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Project predesigns are not required for most of the projects submitted by Dakota County. A predesign is required for Priority #2, the Public Safety and Technology Support Center, but has not yet been submitted since predesign funding is part of the county's request for state funding. |

Dassel: Elevated Water Storage Tank Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$634,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Dassel)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Dassel, in Meeker County

Project At A Glance

The city of Dassel is requesting \$634,500 in state funding to design and construct a new elevated water storage tank to adequately supply water to developing commercial and industrial areas in the city of Dassel.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$634,500 in state funding to design and construct a new elevated water storage tank to adequately supply water to developing commercial and industrial areas in the city of Dassel, Meeker County, Minnesota. There is currently land available for commercial and industrial development in the west portion of the city; however, the city's existing water storage facility is not able to provide adequate water pressure to supply this area. The city completed a feasibility report to study the options available to solve this problem and the most cost-effective option was to construct a new elevated water storage tank and demolish the existing tank, which is in excess of 75-years old. The city of Dassel already has land available to construct a new tower, which would allow for the expansion of city water service to these new areas.

The city of Dassel just updated their Comprehensive Plan. The plan identifies areas that are targeted for commercial and industrial development. Most of the prime area identified was to the west of the city. The elevation of these areas is relatively high in reference to the rest of the city and, therefore, water pressure and available fire flow for new businesses will be an issue.

The city is actively pursuing businesses to come to Dassel and they want to make sure that they have the facilities to support the development.

There is currently land for sale for development at the intersection of TH 12 and TH 15 that has attracted interest from a variety of businesses. At this point in time, there is an existing business in Dassel that is considering the possibility of relocating to this location since they have outgrown their existing property and would like to expand. The city wants to insure the business that they should stay in Dassel rather than relocate to a different region or state. A new elevated water storage tank is crucial to the potential development for both keeping businesses in the area as well as attracting new businesses to the region and state. Dassel offers a centralized location in the state as well as access to two major highway corridors (TH 12 and TH 15).

Total Project Cost:

The total project cost is \$1.269 million. The city of Dassel will contribute 50 percent of the project cost.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned and operated by the city of Dassel.

Project Contact Person

Chuck DeWolf Bolton and Menk Phone: (320) 231-3956

Governor's Recommendations

Dassel: Elevated Water Storage Tank Improvements

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|----------|---|
| <u> </u> | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Dassel City Council adopted a resolution of support on June |
| | 23, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | asparance projects, or mater and materials admitted |

Deer River: Wastewater Treatment Facility Rehabilitation

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$700,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Deer River)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Deer River, in Itasca County

Project At A Glance

The city of Deer River is requesting \$700,000 in state funding to provide rehabilitation to the Deer River Waste Water Treatment Facility.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$700,000 in state funding to provide needed rehabilitation to the Deer River Waste Water Treatment Facility. The facility has reached its design capacity and is restricting growth in the community.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$1.4 million. The city of Deer River will contribute 50 percent of the cost of the project.

Local Significance:

The wastewater treatment facility has reached its design capacity and is adversely affecting growth opportunities in the city. At the same time, Deer River officials feel that they have reached their debt capacity and cannot incur new debt without adversely impacting overall city operations. With state bonding assistance, Deer River can address the growth pressures that have emerged and entertain new residential and economic development projects.

Regional Significance:

If state bonding funds are awarded, Deer River can aggressively pursue new growth opportunities that will increase the cities residential and economic

development opportunities. This will result in a regional benefit to the area by creating new housing developments, new jobs, and increased tax base.

State significance:

By increasing the capacity of Deer River's public infrastructure, new housing and economic development will occur that meets state goals for creating sustainable communities that maintain healthy community concepts.

Other Considerations

The city of Deer River will continue to own and operate the facility. The anticipated start date is during the summer of 2008 and the project is expected to be completed by the fall of 2008.

Project Contact Person

Victor R Williams, City Clerk/Treasurer City of Deer River 208 2nd Street Southeast Deer River, Minnesota 56636

Phone: (218) 246-8195 Fax; (218) 246-9540

Email: drcity@paulbunyan.net

Governor's Recommendations

Deer River: Wastewater Treatment Facility Rehabilitation

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 4 | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Yes, the Deer River City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 11, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| ٥. | requesting? |
| | Yes |
| 10. | 1.77 |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? |
| | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Detroit Lakes: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$24,912,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Detroit Lakes)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Detroit Lakes, in Becker County

Project At A Glance

The city of Detroit Lakes is requesting state funding assistance for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$ 4.482 million for a Conference Center
- ♦ \$20.43 million to construct a multi-use extension of the Heartland Trail from Park Rapids to Detroit Lakes and from Detroit Lakes to Moorhead.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Detroit Lakes Conference Center Project

This request is for \$4,482,500 in state bonding for land acquisition, predesign, design and to construct a 21,300 square foot Conference Center in Detroit Lakes, Minnesota. The facility will encourage meetings and conferences in this region of Minnesota which will be a benefit to area businesses and the region's economy.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total project cost from all Conference Center Project funding sources is \$8.965 million. The city of Detroit Lakes will use local funds to finance 50 percent of the project costs.

Other Considerations

The Conference Center will be owned and operated by the city of Detroit Lakes, however, operations may be conducted by a private party under an

agreement with the city. Start of construction is August 2008 with completion of construction in December 2009

Project Contact Person: Conference Center

Larry Remmen
Community Development Director,
City of Detroit Lakes
PO Box 647
Potroit Lakes Minnesota 56502

Detroit Lakes, Minnesota 56502

Phone: (218) 847-5658 Fax: (218) 847-8969

Email: Iremmen@lakesnet.net

Priority 2: Heartland Trail Extension

This request is for \$20.43 million in state funding for predesign, design, project management and construction of a multi-use trail connecting Park Rapids (Hubbard County), Detroit Lakes (Becker County) and Moorhead (Clay County). There is the possibility of some land acquisition. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) calculates an administration/construction cost of \$243,600.00/mile for the 39 miles of Park Rapids/Detroit Lakes Trail and 45 miles of Detroit Lakes/Moorhead Trail.

The trail will generally follow Trunk Highway 34 (the Lake Country Scenic Byway) between Park Rapids and Detroit Lakes, and generally follow Trunk Highway 10 between Detroit Lakes and Moorhead. "Multi-use" anticipates bicycles, inline skates, walkers and runners, among others.

This trail also has the support of the DNR. A Capital Appropriation of \$250,000 went to the DNR for this trail in the 2006 bonding bill. Laurie Young, Trails Planning Supervisor, Division of Trails and Waterways, DNR, has offered input and support for this bonding bill request, and is actively working on the Master Planning process.

The trail will be an extension of the Heartland Trail that currently connects Bemidji, Walker and Park Rapids. This extension will build upon the successful construction, maintenance, public use, and positive economic

Detroit Lakes: Two Projects

impact of the existing stretch of Heartland Trail. The extension will integrate with the Paul Bunyan Trail to create continuous trails between Detroit Lakes and Brainerd. <u>See Minnesota Parks and Trails Map, Exhibit 14, attached; See Lake Country Scenic Byway map, Exhibit 15, attached.</u>

This multi-use trail will boost tourism in the region. A 1998 State Trail Use Survey by DNR showed 63 percent use by tourists and 28 percent use by locals. Tourists spent \$747,000 of the \$823,000 spent that summer associated with use of the Heartland Trail. A 2004 Explore Minnesota online survey showed that 92 percent of visitors were attracted to the Heartland Trail for the same reasons cited by users of Scenic Byways - the peaceful scenery and wildlife. This trail is also a crucial link in MnDOT's idea of eventually connecting to existing multi-use trails – the Lake Wobegon Trail and Central Lakes Trail between St. Cloud and Fergus Falls.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$20.43 million. The following contributors will be sought: city of Detroit Lakes, Becker County, Hubbard County, Clay County and DNR Trail funds. Additionally, the DNR will be seeking federal transportation enhancement funds.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

Additional state dollars will be required for maintenance and operation after development is complete.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This is not a subsequent phase of an earlier project, but \$250,000 was appropriated for a master planning process study for this trail in the 2006 bonding bill.

Other Considerations

The multi-use trail will be owned and maintained by the state of Minnesota. The DNR indicates that (1) a project Master Plan will be completed in October 2008, (2) Engineering/Design Phase will take place Winter 2008-2009, and (3) Construction will begin Spring 2009. Construction is expected to be completed in that same construction season.

Project Contact Person: Heartland Trail Extension

Larry Remmen
Community Development Director,
City of Detroit Lakes
PO Box 647
Detroit Lakes, Minnesota 56502

Phone: (218) 847-5658 Fax: (218) 847-8969

Email: lremmen@lakesnet.net

Governor's Recommendations

Detroit Lakes: Two Projects

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | For priority #1, the city will use local funds to finance 50% of the |
| | project's cost. |
| | For priority #2, the trail, no non-state matching funds are to be |
| | provided. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? The state mission related to funding local and/or regional community |
| | or conference centers is unclear. State support for these types of |
| | projects varies considerably from biennium to biennium. |
| | projecte varies constantably from plottinant to plottinatin |
| | Providing recreational opportunities via trails is an important state |
| | mission in Minnesota. The state agency develops master plans for |
| | all state trails and seeks a manageable level of state bond funding for |
| | trails in each capital budget cycle. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The Conference Center project is viewed as having primarily a local |
| | or regional benefit. The trail project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| - | Not for priority project #1. For priority #2, trails that are to be owned |
| | and maintained by DNR will increase operating costs in the DNR |
| | budget. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| 7. | projects. |
| ١٠. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| •• | Yes, the Detroit lakes City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 12, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | For priority project #1, a predesign has not yet been submitted. |
| | For priority project #2, a predesign is not required for projects |
| | consisting of raods, bridges, trails or pathways. |

Dodge County: Stagecoach State Trail

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,028,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Dodge County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Dodge County

Project At A Glance

Dodge County requests \$3.028 million in 2008 for Phase 1 of the Stagecoach State Trail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This Dodge County request is for a total of \$9,058,000 in state funding over the period from 2008 – 2012 to acquire land, predesign and design, and construct the Stagecoach State Trail; a 40-mile primarily non-motorized recreational trail which will connect the proposed Prairie Wildflower Trail in Steele County to the existing Douglas State Trail in Olmsted County via three counties, five cities, and seven townships**.

The Stagecoach State Trail represents a significant section of the eleven county regional trail plan as designed by Southeastern Minnesota Association of Regional Trails (SMART) and is another step towards fulfilling the trail development goals of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

The Stagecoach State Trail will provide a safe, alternate multi-use mode of transportation within a regional state trail system. In addition, it will provide health, recreational, and economic benefits to several communities. Tourists and visitors will be encouraged to use the trail because of the historical aspects on the trail routes such as the scenic parks, rivers, streams, forests, lake, wetlands, farmlands, and rest stops that are on the National Register of Historic Sites and Places. All these factors will greatly enhance the quality of life in these rural communities.

Total Project Cost: The total project cost of all three phases of this project is \$9.058 million: \$3.028 million in 2008; \$4.728 million in 2010; and \$1.304 million in 2012. The Dodge County Trails Association (DCTA) is working closely with the state DNR and DOT to capitalize on all existing grant programs available for 2008 and beyond. The DCTA has secured approximately \$61,660 in private land donations for the development of the Stagecoach State Trial.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

Yes. The Stagecoach State Trail will be owned by the state of Minnesota and will be under the jurisdiction of the DNR.

Project Contact Person

Duane Johnson, Dodge County Planning Director 22 6th Street East Mantorville, Minnesota 55955

Phone: (507) 635-6272 Fax: 507-635-6193

Email: duane.m.johnson@co.dodge.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Dodge County: Stagecoach State Trail

| Evaluation of Local Projects To what extent are non-state matching funds cor No non-state matching funds are to be provided. Does project help fulfill an important state missio Providing recreational opportunities via trails is a mission in Minnesota. The state agency developed. | n? n important state s master plans for |
|---|---|
| No non-state matching funds are to be provided. Does project help fulfill an important state missio Providing recreational opportunities via trails is a | n? n important state s master plans for |
| Does project help fulfill an important state missio Providing recreational opportunities via trails is a | n important state s master plans for |
| Providing recreational opportunities via trails is a | n important state s master plans for |
| | s master plans for |
| | |
| all state trails and seeks a manageable level of s | tato bona rananing roi |
| trails in each capital budget cycle. | - |
| 3. Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| The trail project is viewed as having primarily a re | |
| 4. Are new or additional state operating subsidies re | |
| Trails that are to be owned and maintained by DI | NR will increase |
| operating costs in the DNR budget. | |
| 5. Has a state role been expanded in a new policy a | area? |
| See #2 above. | |
| 6. Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek stat | e funding for similar |
| projects. | |
| 7. Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| Not significantly. 8. Has local governing body provided a resolution of | of augment? |
| or I had recail gerening bear promata a recondition a | |
| Yes, resolutions of support have been adopted b Board and by several local City Councils. | y the bodge County |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all prioritized am | niects it is |
| requesting? | OJOOTO IL IS |
| N/A | |
| 10. Has a predesign (required if construction cost is | over \$1.5 million) |
| been submitted? | |
| A predesign is not required for projects consisting | g of roads, bridges, |
| trails or pathways. | , 5, |

Dodge County Four Seasons JPB: Arena Parking Lot

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$150,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Dodge County 4 Seasons JPB)

PROJECT LOCATION: Dodge County

Project At A Glance

Dodge County is requesting \$150,000 in state funding for paving a parking lot at the Dodge County Four Seasons Arena in Kasson.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$150,000 in state funding is for paving the parking lot at the Dodge County Four Seasons Arena in Kasson. This money will cover the excavating, the base structure and the actual blacktop pavement. This parking lot is used for many different occasions by a number of different fair ground users. All of these users help in the economic development for the surrounding areas.

This project will have local, regional and statewide significance because of the many different users. The arena is used 11 months out of the year for youth and high school hockey. The parking lot is also the only way to get to the pit area of the Dodge County Speedway. The Dodge County free fair utilizes the area for many of their vendors and is a major walking traffic area. The parking lot also hosts the Big Iron Truck show, which brings in over 400 trucks from all over the United States.

Total Project Cost:

The total project cost is \$150,000.

Other Considerations

The parking lot is located on the Dodge County Fairgrounds so it will be owned by the Dodge County Fairboard, but will be mostly operated by the Dodge County Four Seasons Arena. Dodge counts expects to start this project in May of 2008 and be completed by July of 2008.

Project Contact Person

Howarth (Dodge County Four Seasons Arena Manager)

100 11th Street Northeast Kasson, Minnesota 55944

Phone: (507) 634-2222 email: SHOW148802@aol.com

Governor's Recommendations

Dodge County Four Seasons JPB: Arena Parking Lot

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state role in funding civic center and community center style |
| | projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to |
| | another. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Not yet received. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for this project. |
| _ | |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$20,655,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Duluth)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Duluth, St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Duluth requests three projects (in priority order):

- ♦ \$12.75 million to construct Sanitary Sewer Overflow storage facilities
- ♦ \$2.18 million to construct an expanded Polar Bear exhibit at the Lake Superior Zoological Gardens
- \$5.75 million to assist in the predesign, design and Phase 1 construction of new terminal facilities at the Duluth International Airport. This is a joint request with the Duluth Airport Authority; it is the number 1 priority of the Duluth Airport Authority and the number three priority of the city of Duluth.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Sanitary Sewer Overflow Storage Facilities

This request is for \$12.75 million in state funding to proceed with construction of Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO) storage facilities at selected locations in the city of Duluth. These facilities would serve as storage sites for sanitary sewer system flows that increase significantly in volume during precipitation runoff or other similar events – thereby reducing the incidents of sanitary sewer system overflows that historically occur during these events, as well as related public safety and health concerns.

The city's sanitary sewer system consists of approximately 400 miles of mains, and serves approximately 27,000 connections. Over 55 percent of the city's sanitary sewer system was installed prior to 1950, with 35 percent of

the system over 80 years old. The city of Duluth and the Western Lake Superior Sanitary District (WLSSD) are under both a state and federal mandates to eliminate the overflows of sewage from pump stations and sewer lines within their systems. As co-permittees in a five—year permit issued in 2002 by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) both are required to "control or eliminate" all overflows in eighteen locations. Despite the expenditure of \$48 million in funds in the past four years — eliminating fourteen of these overflows — in early January 2004, the Environmental Protection Agency issued an Administrative Order (U.S. EPA Docket No. V-W-04 — AO) which demanded that a plan and time schedule from Duluth and WLSSD be submitted which completely eliminates all SSO from their respective systems. On 02-22-2007 the U.S. Department of Justice gave the proposed Consent Decree to the city of Duluth outlining penalties, stipulated penalties, accelerated compliance schedule and other terms for response.

Since receipt of the Administrative Order and submission of the required Plan of Action, the city of Duluth and WLSSD have constructed three sanitary sewer overflow basins with a fourth currently under construction, all of which are adjacent to overflow locations. These basins are designed to eliminate five of the overflow locations. Overflows are of particular concern as Lake Superior is designated as an "Outstand Resource Valued Water" by the Minnesota legislature under the Great Lake Water Quality Initiative.

In great part due to these expenditure levels, sanitary sewer rates within the city have risen more than 60 percent over the last eight years, resulting in sewer service charges of approximately \$38.00 per month for an average residential property—the highest in the upper midwest.

In addition to the efforts undertaken to date, the city is constantly looking to new programs and technologies to further reduce system I&I – including possible modifications/improvements to the drain disconnection program and implementation of a sewer lateral rehabilitation program. However, and despite these efforts, the inflow and infiltration of surface and/or groundwater – especially during precipitation/runoff events – continues to add significant volumes of relatively clear water to the city's sanitary sewer system. Given the finite capacity of the system, these increased I&I volumes result in SSOs at various locations during these peak flow periods. As a result, there is now a need for the city to incorporate SSO storage facilities into the system at select locations.

This project has local, regional and statewide significance in that (a) it will directly reduce the incidents of sanitary sewer overflows within the city of Duluth, (b) it will assist in ongoing efforts to improve the overall water quality in the region's natural watersheds – most notably the St. Louis River and Lake Superior, and (c) it will allow for the continued operation and expansion of public infrastructure system necessary to meet the economic vitality and growth of this area of the state of Minnesota – an area with historical statewide, national and global economic significance.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost for the Sanitary Sewer Overflow Storage Facilities project is \$35 million. The city of Duluth will match the state funds requested above on a dollar-for-dollar basis. To date the city has either bonded for the work or applied and received low interest loans through the Public Facilities Authority. Currently the federal government is considering an appropriation of \$14 million in the Water Resource Development Act to address sanitary sewer overflows problems in Duluth, Congress is anticipated to act on this bill in the fourth quarter of 2007.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The city of Duluth requested and received appropriations for \$4.95 million from the 2005 Capital Budget for the first phase of constructing SSO storage facilities along Lake Superior. There are three facilities already built and in operation with a fourth currently under construction to which these funds are being applied.

Other Considerations

The SSO storage facilities would be owned and operated by the city of Duluth. The SSO storage facilities project design and development (to be funded by the city of Duluth) will begin in the second half of 2007. Construction of SSO storage facilities is expected to begin in August 2008, with the first basin operational by October 2009 and with other tanks operational no later than 2011.

The 2008 request is for \$12,750,000. The total estimated construction cost for the city's current comprehensive SSO storage facility project is approximately \$56 - 60 million, with this 2008 Capital Budget Request representing the second phase of this comprehensive project. The results

and outcomes of the first and second phase will be used to determine if future phases would proceed as currently proposed. If the project does proceed in future phases, the City would anticipate submitting similar Capital Budget Requests in 2010 for \$9,000,000.

Project Contact Person: SSO Storage Facilities

David J. Prusak
Chief Engineer of Utilities, Public Works and Utilities
City of Duluth
411 W 1st Street – Room 211
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

Phone: (218) 730-5072 Fax: (218) 730-5907

Email: dprusak@ci.duluth.mn.us

Priority 2: Expanded Polar Bear Exhibit at the Lake Superior Zoological Gardens.

The Lake Superior Zoological Gardens is proposing that the current polar bear facility be expanded to encompass a much larger footprint. A new proposed expansion would accomplish the following in order to preserve this asset and improve the lives of the polar bears at the zoo and increase public awareness as to the plight of the polar bear in the wild:

- The land space would be increased dramatically adding as much as 23,000 square feet to the existing yard. The new yard would include natural substrate such as grass and dirt. The current facility has acceptable standards for water quality and volume so the new facility will only include a small water feature.
- Two new viewing spaces would be added so that the public can better view the bears. A "training wall" and amphitheater would be included to assist in the zoos conservation and education mission.
- Interactive elements will assist in creating elements where zoo guests will be allowed to view the bears from a perspective not normally utilized.
- ♦ A shaded area will be incorporated to allow the bears to remove themselves from the heat during warmer months.

- A snowmaking machine will be included to produce piles of snow for enrichment when there is no natural snow on the ground.
- It will allow for the zoo to become a potential breeding site for future bears allowing the zoo to play a role in the genetic and demographic management of bears in zoos.

The zoo staff realizes that without these needed improvements the zoo may not be able to acquire polar bears in the future. Because polar bears are a fixture at the zoo and in the community and region, and because of the status of polar bears in the wild, the Lake Superior Zoological Gardens would like to make a long-term commitment to exhibiting polar bears. The exhibit is now and will always be the centerpiece of the zoo.

In addition to the efforts undertaken to date, the city and local Zoo Society are constantly looking to new programs and exhibits to further enhance the existing assets and improve attendance at this facility. However, and despite the quality efforts, given previous legislative commitments and financial support allocated to the other metropolitan zoos, for the Duluth Zoo to remain competitive, current and relative to local visitors and tourists alike, all the while increasing efforts to expand its programs, attendance and exhibit enhancement, it continues to be difficult without ongoing state of Minnesota operating assistance at this facility. The existing Polar Shore exhibit will benefit greatly from this proposed expansion, as would the overall zoo, its other exhibits, the community, the region and the state as a whole.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The Expanded Polar Bear Exhibit at the Lake Superior Zoological Gardens project cost for 2008 is estimated to be \$4.36 million. The city of Duluth, in conjunction and partnership with the Lake Superior Zoological Society, will match the \$2.18 million in state funds requested above on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The city of Duluth received appropriations for \$600,000 from the 2006 Capital Budget for the correction of life support systems associated with water treatment of the existing pools, which make up the current Polar Shores Exhibit. The city of Duluth matched these funds, dedicating \$200,000 of its Capital Improvement funds. These two pools already built and in operation, will remain with this expansion and are necessary and required as we

propose to expand and improve the polar bear habitat, enhancing current assets of the zoo.

Other Considerations

The Expanded Polar Bear Exhibit would be owned and operated by the city of Duluth.

The Expanded Polar Bear Exhibit project design and programming will begin in first half of 2008. Construction of the exhibit expansion would be tentatively scheduled to begin in 2009 with completion by 2010.

Project Contact Person: Expanded Polar Bear Exhibit

Terry L. Groshong, AIA
Interim City Architect
City of Duluth
411 W 1st Street – Room 208
Duluth, Minnesota 55802
Phone: (218) 730-5730
Fax: (218) 730-5920

Email: tgroshong@ci.duluth.mn.us

Priority 3: Duluth International Airport New Terminal Building, Terminal Area and Apron Improvements

This request is for \$5.725 million in state funding in 2008 for the predesign, design and Phase 1 construction of new terminal facilities at the Duluth International Airport.

This project has local, regional and statewide significance as the Duluth International Airport is the second largest airport in Minnesota and serves a regional population in Northeastern Minnesota and Northwestern Wisconsin of over 500,000. The current Duluth Airport Terminal was constructed in the early 1970s and is no longer capable of accommodating modern air travel requirements and the current passenger demand experienced at the airport. Airport terminal hold rooms are too small and cannot adequately accommodate passengers on the MD-80, A-320, and DC-9 aircraft which are

using the facility multiple times each day. The terminal does not have secureside hold room restrooms or concessions, and ground-level operations are very inconvenient and hazardous during certain times of the year to airline passengers. It is well documented with the Federal Aviation Administration that the existing building is too close to the adjacent taxiway and primary runway as the tails of the aircraft parked at the terminal gates protrude into restricted airspace.

Additionally, the events of September 11, 2001, have completely changed airport security requirements adversely impacting passenger flow and making the existing facility dysfunctional. Over the past two years, the Duluth International Airport has recruited additional airline service to the community resulting in record passenger numbers. The current facility has outlived its useful life and can no longer accommodate the space needs of the increasing airline and passenger traffic. The current facility cannot be expanded due to the proximity of the building to the taxiway and runway environment.

The project consists of constructing a new terminal facility to accommodate current and future passenger growth, enhance security, and consolidate baggage and passenger screening functions in order to meet current and long-term needs to accommodate airline services and passengers at the Duluth International Airport. Additionally, the improvements are required in order to safely, securely and efficiently move expanding numbers of passengers through the terminal complex. The project goals are as follows:

- Construct a new terminal building to provide an efficient, modern and functional airport terminal complex, economically appropriate to the needs and resources of the regional community, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Transportation Security Administration (TSA) through new construction.
- Provide security and safety improvements to the terminal complex and surrounding environs to meet current and planned requirements of the TSA and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).
- Accommodate the projected growth in passenger demand to adequately service the Northeast Minnesota and Northwest Wisconsin regions.
- Provide a terminal and support areas to meet the current and future needs of the aviation and airline industries.

Priority 3 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Duluth International Airport project is \$35.957 million in 2008 and \$36.121 million in 2010, for a total project cost of \$72.078 million. Federal funds of \$37.637 million will be contributed to the project, and the Duluth Airport Authority will contribute \$5.2 million. St. Louis County is also contributing \$250,000 the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Duluth will own the new airline passenger terminal and the Duluth Airport Authority will manage and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person: Duluth International Airport

Mr. Brian D. Ryks, Executive Director Duluth Airport Authority 4701 Grinden Drive Duluth, Minnesota 55811 Phone: (218) 727-2968

Governor's Recommendations

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

Duluth: Three Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local | |
| | government funds. | |
| | Priority 2: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local | |
| | government and private sources. | |
| | Priority 3: 61% of the entire project costs are to be provided from | |
| | federal and local sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priority 1: The state has an existing grant program to provide | |
| | financial assistance in this area. | |
| | Priority 2: Providing recreational and educational opprotuntities is an | |
| | important state mission. However, the degree to which these types | |
| | of projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| | Priority 3: The state has an existing grant program to provide | |
| _ | financial assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | Priority 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local and | |
| | regional benefit. | |
| | Priority 2: This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| | Priority 3: This project is viewed as having primarily a regional | |
| | benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priorities 1, 2 and 3: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | Priorities 1, 2 and 3: See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | Priorities 1,2 and 3: The number of this type of local request | |
| | suggests that additional requests will be forthcoming from local units | |
| | of government if the state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Priorities 1, 2 and 3: Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Resolutions have not been received for either the Priority 1 or Priority | |
| | 2 projects. For the Priority 3 project, the Duluth Airport Authority has | |
| | submitted minutes of a December 2006 meeting where the Authority | |
| | expressed its support for the project. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |

10. Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?

Priority 1: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities.

Priorities 2 and 3: Predesigns have not yet been submitted for these projects.

DECC (Duluth): DECC/UMD Arena

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$40,283,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (DECC)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Duluth, St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center Authority (DECC) is requesting \$40.283 million in state funding for capital improvements including the design and construction of a new Duluth Arena.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center Authority (DECC) is requesting \$40,283,154 in state funding for Capital Improvements including the design and construction of a new Duluth Arena.

The Authority Board, which consists of four gubernatorial and seven mayoral appointments oversees Duluth's Auditorium, Duluth OMNIMAX® Theatre, City Side and Harbor Side Convention Centers and the retired ore carrier, the S.S. William A. Irvin, Tug Lake Superior and the Coast Guard Cutter Sundew.

The Authority also manages the existing Duluth Arena which will be over 40 years old in 2007. The new Arena will provide a new home for UMD Hockey and attracts more and larger events to Northern Minnesota. The new Arena will be located on the existing DECC footprint located on Duluth's waterfront.

The new facility will provide UMD Hockey with

- ♦ A larger 200 x 85 foot rink
- ♦ Increased seating capacity from 5,100 to 6,630

- State of the art locker and training facilities
- A facility with modern spectator facilities suites, club seats, concessions
- Accessible and expanded media space

The DECC and UMD has over a 40 year partnership showcasing Division 1 College Hockey in downtown Duluth. The new Arena will allow the UMD Women's and Men's Hockey programs to be competitive well into the future.

The new Arena project will exceed the Minnesota Building guidelines. In fact, the goal of the DECC Board and Design Team is to construct the first LEED-certified Arena in the world. Meeting or exceeding Minnesota sustainable building guidelines are required in the contracts with both the Design Team and the Construction Manager.

The Arena is using an integrated design process to achieve a 50 percent reduction in electrical use compared to similar arenas. In addition, the DECC is currently heated by hot water generated by wasted heat from the Duluth Steam Co-op. That system was installed in 2005; it has the capacity to and will heat the new facility.

Total Project Cost

The total project cost is \$80.556 million. The 50% non-state share of costs will be funded through issuing local 25-year bonds, the debt service for which will be paid through a combination of: 1) revenues from a city of Duluth 0.75 percent increase in the food and beverage tax; 2) payments from the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD); and 3) payments from the DECC Authority.

DECC (Duluth): DECC/UMD Arena

Other Considerations

The project schedule is:

Planning and Budgeting Complete

Schematic Design May – June 2008
Design Development July – October 2008

Construction Documents

Bids and Awards

Procurement

Construction

October 2008 – January 2009

January 2009 – May 2009

February 2009 – May 2009

January 2009 – October 2010

Completion October 2010

The Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center Authority will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Daniel J. Russell, Executive Director Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center Authority 350 Harbor Drive Duluth, Minnesota 55802-2698

Phone: (218) 722-5573 ext. 203

Fax: (218) 722-4247 Email: drussell@decc.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$40.283 million for this project, through a grant agreement with the state Department of Employment and Economic Development.

DECC (Duluth): DECC/UMD Arena

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 50% of the project costs will be provided by non-state (primarily local) sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? The state role in funding civic and event center projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to another. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local and regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? The number of this type of local request suggests that additional requests will likely be forthcoming from other local units of government if the state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Directors of the DECC Authority adopted an updated resolution of support on June 4, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A project predesign is in process. | |

Duluth Airport Authority (joint request with city)

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$0

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Duluth Airport Authority)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Duluth, St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The Duluth Airport Authority is requesting state funding for design, predesign and phase 1 construction of new terminal facilities at the Duluth International Airport. This is a joint request with the city of Duluth.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The Duluth Airport Authority, jointly with the city of Duluth is requesting \$5,725,000 in state funding to assist with predesign, design, and phase 1 construction of new terminal facilities at the Duluth International Airport.

To find information on this project, please refer to the project request submitted by the city of Duluth.

Duluth Airport Authority (joint request with city)

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | To find the evaluation of this project, please refer to the project |
| | request submitted by the city of Duluth. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? |

Eden Prairie: Camp Eden Wood Renovations

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$7,788,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Eden Prairie)

PROJECT LOCATION: Eden Prairie, in Hennepin County

Project At A Glance

- The city of Eden Prairie requests state capital funding assistance to improve the buildings and grounds at Camp Eden Wood to serve the recreational and educational needs of Minnesota's disabled adults and children.
- Camp Eden Wood is owned by the city of Eden Prairie and operated by Friendship Ventures, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that provides short-term, direct care services for adults and children with developmental disabilities.
- ◆ The project is of statewide significance because it serves Minnesota residents from all over the state.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Eden Prairie requests \$7.788 million (\$6.21 million plus \$1.578 million using the Department of Finance calculation for cost escalation) to improve the buildings and grounds at Camp Eden Wood to serve the recreational and educational needs of Minnesota's disabled adults and children.

Camp Eden Wood is owned by the city of Eden Prairie and operated by Friendship Ventures, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that provides short-term, direct care services for adults and children with developmental disabilities. The project is of statewide significance because it serves Minnesota residents from all over the state.

The project involves the acquisition of land; demolition and removal of substandard buildings; design and construction of new residential dormitory facilities; design and construction of landscape improvements; appropriate renovations to historically significant buildings at the site; and furniture/fixtures/equipment for the new facilities. The new facilities will provide an "Up North" camp experience for the clients of Friendship Ventures that is unparalleled in the Twin Cities metro area.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Camp Eden Wood project is \$7.97 million, before escalation for inflation. Including escalation brings the total project cost to \$9.548 million. The city will contribute \$1.06 million to the project, and Friendship Ventures will contribute another \$700 thousand.

Other Considerations

The city of Eden Prairie will own the facility. The facility will be operated by Friendship Ventures.

Project Contact Person

Scott Neal, City Manager City of Eden Prairie 8080 Mitchell Road Eden Prairie, Nata 55344

Phone: (952) 949-8410

Email: sneal@edenprairie.org

Governor's Recommendations

Eden Prairie: Camp Eden Wood Renovations

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 11% local and 7% private funds will match 82% in state funding. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state role in funding recreational opportunities for disabled youth |
| | and adults is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Eden Prairie City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | July 17, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Not yet submitted. |

Ellendale: Water System / Distribution Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$653,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Ellendale)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Ellendale, in Steele County

Project At A Glance

The city of Ellendale is requesting \$653,000 in state funding to reconstruct critical elements of a water distribution system in the city of Ellendale.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$653,000 in state funds to reconstruct critical elements of a failing water distribution system in the city of Ellendale. In 2007, the city has undertook substantial improvements to the water system including : new 150,000 gallon water storage, new water filtration plant and treatment facility, two new wells and new water metering of the entire community. The total investment by the city for these improvements is \$1.931 million. The city utilized the Public Facilities Authority and a local bond to finance 100 percent of these improvements. The existing water distribution system consists of mostly four and six inch diameter, lead-jointed, cast iron (CIP) water mains installed in the 1930s and 1940s. There are also several blocks of 1-1/4 and 1-1/2 inch water lines. Today the minimum size recommended is six inch. Because of the numerous blocks of small diameter water main, there are a number of areas throughout the system that experience very low flow during daily use activities. These conditions and the significant deterioration of the water lines, have also lead to frequent water line breaks. With the improved water treatment and storage, the city will have resolved part of the water needs. However, the improved pressure will also present additional problems since the undersized and poor condition of the existing lines will only lead to more frequent and larger water line failures. The need to replace the water lines is now more important to provide an adequate distribution system to the residents of the city.

The project has been requested to be placed on the Project Priority List and the Intended Use Plan for 2008. In 2007 this project was ranked at 71st on the PPL and received 12 points. The project was not in the fundable range in 2007 and the city began to pursue Rural Development funding for a loan and grant combination.

With the increasing costs, the monthly average user fee without state assistance will approach \$66.50. Even with state assistance of \$653,000 the average monthly user charge will exceed 55.00 per month. This exceeds the Rural Development definition of affordability of 1.7 percent of the Median Household Income.

This project has local significance to the Ellendale community since the impact on residents with limited income (MHI of only \$37,750) is significant. This impact is not only economic but also without the improvement, residents will not be provided with adequate water distribution after making an investment in the city's water well, treatment and storage capacity.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of the project is \$1.176 million. A Public Facilities Authority (or Rural Development) loan will fund \$523,000 of the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Ellendale will own and operate the water system.

Project Contact Person

Doug Flugum, Mayor City of Ellendale PO Box 68 Ellendale, Minnesota 56026 Home: (507) 688-3003 City Office: (507) 684-9487

Governor's Recommendations

Ellendale: Water System / Distribution Improvements

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| _ | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 44% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Ellendale City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 28, 2007 |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | soparation projects, or water and wastewater racinities. |

Ely: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,064,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Ely)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Ely, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Ely requests state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$1.564 million to realign a section of street to improve access to Ely Regional Hospital, and to extend utilities to a 900-acre parcel for new development
- \$500,000 to reconstruct the roadway and improve utilities for 17th Avenue

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Ely Regional Hospital Access and Utility Improvements

The city of Ely is requesting \$1.564 million for the Ely Hospital Access and West End Infrastructure Improvements project. This state money will provide 33 percent of the project cost and be used for construction and professional services to complete the project.

The St. Louis County Public Works Department has scheduled the Central Avenue Roadway Improvement project for 2009. In conjunction with this project, the city of Ely will replace the deteriorating infrastructure in this area. To improve access to the hospital campus, realignment of a three-block section of Pattison Street is required. Along with the realignment, utilities will be extended to serve a 900-acre parcel that the city of Ely and the Town of Morse are working to develop. The city and the Township have been working over the past year on the details of the annexation agreement.

The realignment of Pattison Street will also open up the redevelopment of the city of Ely's Public Works Garage site. The city of Ely, along with St. Louis County and Lake County have completed construction of the new Joint Public Works Facility on the east end of town. This project totaled \$7 million and combined the existing Ely and St. Louis County Public Works Departments, allowing for the redevelopment of their old facilities within the city of Ely. The city of Ely's portion of this project totaled approximately \$3 million.

The realignment of Pattison Street will allow for improved access to the hospital campus. Current access is limited to narrow residential streets, which are in poor condition. The new alignment will improve delivery access to the campus and remove delivery vehicles from residential streets, improving safety in this area of Ely. The realignment will also improve access to the helicopter pad at the hospital for emergency vehicles.

This project has local, regional and state-wide significance. The project will improve County Highway 21, which is a heavily traveled highway entering Ely. With Ely being a major tourist destination, improvements to the roadway will benefit the local economy and the many visitors to Ely. The city of Ely and town of Morse are also working together to develop a 900-acre parcel of property in this area. Roadway improvements and utility extensions are required to complete this work. This will provide regional significance. This project is planned to provide for housing and recreational opportunities, which will support the many economic development projects.

Improving access to the hospital campus also will result in regional impact. The Ely Hospital is the primary care facility for a very large geographical area. The hospital is also currently working to add an assisted living facility to their campus. Realignment of Pattison Street and utility upgrades in both Central Avenue and Pattison Street are required for these projects.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total project cost for all funding sources for all years and all capital costs is \$4.624 million. The amount of state funds requested in the 2008 bonding cycle is \$1.564 million.

The city of Ely is requesting grant dollars from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 569 Program and St. Louis County Community Development Block Grant Program. These applications will request \$800,000

Ely: Two Projects

in funding for construction in 2009. The city of Ely has also requested placement on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) Project Priority List for possible loan funding. The city of Ely will request placement on the MPCA and Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) Intended Use Plans for this project in 2008. The city of Ely has street and infrastructure funds designated for this project totaling \$160,000. St. Louis County Public Works has estimated their portion of the project to cost \$2.1 million of the project total and they will be using county state-aid money for this work.

Other Considerations

The city of Ely will own and operate the Pattison Street Realignment and Utility Improvements. St. Louis County controls the Central Avenue right-of-way. The West End Development Area consists primarily of property owned by the city of Ely and Morse Township. This area will be made available for housing and recreational opportunities in support of the various economic development projects being started in the area. Construction is to begin in May 2009 and be completed by June 2010.

Project Contact Person

The Honorable Charles Novak Mayor, City of Ely 209 East Chapman Street Ely, Minnesota 55731 Phone: (218) 365-3224

FAX: (218) 365-7811

Priority 2: 17th Avenue East Roadway and Utility Improvements Project.

The city of Ely is requesting \$500,000 for the 17th Avenue East Roadway and Utility Improvement project. This money will cover 50 percent of the project cost and be used for construction and professional services to complete the project.

This roadway is used to access student housing and recreational facilities on the Vermilion Community College campus. It is also a truck route used to access an industrial park and the Ely Business Park. The existing roadway is gravel with a very poor roadbed, which is nearly impassible in the spring and after heavy rain. A large drainage ditch is also in the area that collects a very large drainage area including state Highway 1 and 169. Due to the large drainage area, the ditch often overflows and causes flooding. As part of this project, the drainage system will be improved and the culverts replaced.

The roadway also provides access to student housing and recreation facilities on the Vermilion Community College campus. Due to the current conditions of the roadway, lack of sidewalks and overall narrow width, there are safety concerns. By reconstructing and widening the roadway, a sidewalk will be provided for the safety of the students and other pedestrians. The roadway will also be widened to provide for parking along the recreation facilities.

Improvements to the existing utilities in the area are also required. The current water main does not provide adequate volume to the college and the current sanitary sewer serving the college also requires upgrading.

Vermilion Community College is part of the state education system and is an important educational facility for the region and the state of Minnesota. Improvements to 17th Avenue East will result in increased safety and a reliable infrastructure system for the college.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total project cost for all funding sources for all years and all capital costs is estimated at \$1 million. The amount of state bonding money requested is \$500,000.

The city of Ely will also be requesting funding from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 569 program, St. Louis County Community Development Block Grant Program and other funding sources including the MPCA and MDH. The city of Ely has street and infrastructure funds designated for this project totaling \$160,000.

Other Considerations

Design is planned to begin in September 2009 and construction will be completed in September 2010. The improvements to 17th Avenue East will be part of an ongoing project, which included St. Louis County's reconstruction

Ely: Two Projects

of Camp Street and a section of 17th Avenue East between Camp Street and Sheridan Street and the city of Ely's construction of Minder Drive in 1999, which accesses the Ely Business Park. The city of Ely will own and maintain this roadway. The city of Ely is working to complete a truck route to remove heavy truck traffic from the downtown area. Due to steep grades and pedestrian traffic, a truck route is required. This project will complete a portion of the truck route.

Project Contact Person

The Honorable Charles Novak Mayor, City of Ely 209 East Chapman Street Ely, Minnesota 55731

Phone: (218) 365-3224 Fax: (218) 365-7811

Governor's Recommendations

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Priority 1: 67% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. Priority 2: 50% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state | |
| | funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Transportation is an important state mission. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? These projects are viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Ely City Council adopted a resolution of support on June 19, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Predesigns are not required for either of these types of projects. | |

Fairmont: Winnebago Avenue Sports Complex

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Fairmont)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Fairmont, in Martin County

Project At A Glance

The city of Fairmount requests \$500,000 in state funding to build a sports complex.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$500,000 in state funding to build a multi-field sports complex on property owned by the city of Fairmont.

The city of Fairmont currently owns a small four acre softball complex on Winnebago Avenue. The facility does not have regulation fields, restrooms, or concessions. Approximately four years ago, an additional 15 acres came available for sale adjacent to the existing facility. Through the city's Park Board and city Council, public input was solicited on the needs of recreational facilities in the community. Three areas of deficiency were addressed:

- ♦ The lack of regulation ball fields to help attract regional tournaments to the area and accommodate the need of area participants
- The need for a safe place to roller blade along with skate park features for more advanced skaters
- The need for soccer fields

The city Council concluded a strategic planning and goal setting session at the end of 2000/beginning of 2001. These three projects became priorities for Fairmont's overall recreation plan. In the Spring/Summer of 2001, construction of the skate park was completed. This project is on the same property. Cost of the project was \$150,000. At the Monday, 2-26-2001 city Council meeting, the Council outlined plans for an eight-field soccer complex in the southeast part of the community close to the city's new aquatic park. Over 50 residents attended the meeting to provide input. These fields are complete with paved parking, restrooms and concessions. They were completed with city funds.

The complete rehabilitation of the Winnebago Avenue Sports Complex will help to enhance the overall recreational opportunities in the community and surrounding 35-50 mile radius. While these ball diamonds will be constructed for adult regulation softball, the city anticipates having portable fencing that will allow for younger children to play baseball at different age levels. Therefore, the project targets participants of all ages.

The city of Fairmont is situated around five lakes. Recreational activity is very high in the summer time. Fairmont is a regional recreation center for a surrounding 35-50 mile radius. The rehabilitation and expansion of the softball complex would assist the community in meeting regional needs in the area while at the same time boosting tourism in Fairmont with the ability to hold more regional and state wide tournaments. Combining the skate park and ball fields make for a large recreational complex serving all ages, through a large regional sports complex. The project also goes along way toward some neighborhood revitalization. The city has spent in excess of \$750,000 on housing rehabilitation in the northern part of the community. The park complex will enhance and support this endeavor.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$1,256,656. The city contributed \$242,000 to the project in prior years and intends to contribute \$514,656 more to the project in the future.

Other Considerations

The city of Fairmount will own and operate the facility.

Fairmont: Winnebago Avenue Sports Complex

Project Contact Person

Mike Humpal, CEcD Assistant City Administrator 100 Downtown Plaza, PO Box 751 Fairmont, Minnesota 56031

Phone: (507) 238-9461, ext. 2236

Fax: (507) 238-9469 Email: ecodevo@fairmont.org

Governor's Recommendations

Fairmont: Winnebago Avenue Sports Complex

| | Evaluation of Local Decisets |
|-----|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state role in funding sports center projects is unclear and has |
| | varied considerably from one biennium to another |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Fairmont City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | May 14, 2007 |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| | |

Faribault: Three Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$11,426,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Faribault)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Faribault, in Rice County

Project At A Glance

The city of Faribault requests for three capital projects:

- ♦ \$8.676 million for upgrades to a water reclamation facility
- ♦ \$1.75 million for reconstruction of a portion of Trunk Highway 60
- ♦ \$1 million for the construction of the Mill Towns State Trail

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Faribault Water Reclamation Facility

This request is for \$8.676 million in state funding for pre-design, design, equipment, and construction for a \$17.49 million water reclamation facility upgrade. The upgrade is required as part of a mediated agreement between the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and the Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy requiring the city of Faribault to meet a 1 mg/L phosphorus discharge by 12-31-2010. In addition, the city has been notified that the MPCA intends to mandate that the city meet an ammonia discharge limit and will likely see significantly more stringent phosphorus discharge limits because of the Lake Byllesby Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and potentially later in the Lake Pepin TMDL. Regional and statewide pollution problems are being addressed by the facility upgrade.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the water reclamation facility is \$17.49 million. The city will pay \$8.814 million of the total.

Other Considerations

The city of Faribault will own and operate the facility.

Project #2: Highway 60 Reconstruction

This request is for \$1.75 million to reconstruct and widen Trunk Highway (TH) 60 from I-35 to Canby Avenue to a four-lane divided highway with a new signalized intersection at 38th Avenue. Project will result in the creation of North and South Service Drives allowing elimination of direct access to TH 60, which will improve safety and mobility of the trunk highway. Project will also facilitate commercial development. Project costs include design, permitting and construction of highway improvements and 38th Avenue crossover between proposed service drives. TH 60 currently carries 9,900 vehicles per day and traffic is expected to double with commercial development and continued growth in the I-35 corridor. Project is consistent with Rice County Transportation Plan and city of Faribault Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Also allows for consolidation of commercial development in one area rather than scattered development at multiple I-35 Interchanges slowing growth of local traffic using I-35 for shopping. Improvements to TH 60 will facilitate traffic between Faribault and Mankato, two regional trade centers as well as commuters who live in the Faribault lakes area. Providing additional concentration of shopping alternatives locally will reduce the congestion on I-35 and TH 60. Consequently, project should be considered to have regional significance.

Project #2 Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$3.5 million. The city will pay 50 percent of the project cost from city funds.

Other Considerations

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) will own the TH 60 improvements and the city of Faribault will own the supporting local street system.

Project #3: Mill Towns State Trail

This request is for \$1 million in state funding for the construction of the Mill Towns State Trail, for the purpose of providing transportation and recreation.

Faribault: Three Projects

The construction of the state trail was designated by the Minnesota Legislature in 2000, as a recreational trail extending in the city of Faribault from the connection with the Sakatah Singing Hills Trail to the cities of Dundas, Northfield and extending to Cannon Falls for the Cannon Valley Recreational Trail. This will create a state recreational trail system, extending from the city of Mankato to the city of Red Wing. The project ties to the state recreational trails system for the southeastern part of Minnesota and has been approved by the Department of Natural Resources through a master plan adopted in 2005.

Project #3 Total Project Cost: The total cost for the Mill Towns State Trail project is \$11,678,767. One million dollars was contributed to the project by the Mill Towns Board in 2006, \$300,000 was contributed to the project in 2005, and \$350,000 was contributed in 2000. No non-state funds will be contributed to this project in the future.

Other Considerations

The state Department of Natural Resources will own and operate the trail.

Project Contact Person

Timothy C. Madigan, City Administrator City Hall 208 Northwest 1st Avenue Faribault, Minnesota 55021

Phone: (507)333-0355 Fax: (507)333-0399

Email: tmadigan@ci.faribault.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

Faribault: Three Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | Priority 1: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local |
| | government funds. |
| | Project 2: 50% of project costs will be paid from city funds. |
| _ | Project 3: the trail: No non-state matching funds are to be provided. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Priority 1: The state has an existing grant program to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| | illialiciai assistance ili tilis alea. |
| | Project 2 (the Highway 60 Reconstruction project): Transportation is an important state mission. Mn/DOT is responsible for developing |
| | projects on the trunk highway system. |
| | Project 3 (the Mill Towns Trail project): Providing recreational |
| | opportunities via trails is an important state mission in Minnesota. |
| | The state agency develops master plans for all state trails and seeks |
| | a manageable level of state bond funding for trails in each capital |
| | budget cycle. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | Priority 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| | Project 2: This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| | Project 3: The trail project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | Priority 1: No |
| | Project 2: No |
| | Project 3: Trails that are to be owned and maintained by DNR will |
| | increase operating costs in the DNR budget. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No, see #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | Priority 1: The number of this type of local request suggests that |
| | additional requests will be forthcoming from local units of government |
| | if the state provides funding for this project. |
| | Project 2: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar trunk highway projects. |
| | Project 3: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding |
| | for similar state trail projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | The trail project has the potential to, if the state's overall |
| | development plan is expanded and/or its timetable is not followed |

| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Priority 1 and Project 3: Yes, the Faribault City Council adopted a resolution of support for both of these requests on June 26, 2007. |
|-----|--|
| | Project 2: The Faribault City Council adopted a resolution of support for the project on October 25, 2005. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? The city has identified its number 1 priority, but did not prioritize among its other two requested projects. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Priority 1: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. Projects 2 and 3: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of raods, bridges, trails or pathways. |

Fridley: Springbrook Nature Center SPRING Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,815,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Fridley)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Fridley, in Anoka County

Project At A Glance

The city of Fridley requests \$2.815 million in state funding for a redeveloped interpretive center and natural area at Springbrook Nature Center.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2.815 million in state funding to predesign, design, construct, furnish, and equip a redeveloped and expanded interpretive center and surrounding landscaped and natural area at Springbrook Nature Center in Fridley, Minnesota. The purpose of the SPRING project is to enhance Springbrook Nature Center as a learning center and as a destination and gathering place for people from the metropolitan area, the state, and Fridley, while managing the site's social carrying capacity to allow sustainable growth in use, as well as preservation of the natural beauty and habitat of the site's wildlife sanctuary.

This project will upgrade and expand diverse environmental education capacity, visitor viewing, and exhibit space. It will provide expanded community celebration and memorial areas, as well as outdoor classrooms, circular pathways, wellness areas, picnic and pavilion space, and expanded parking.

The Springbrook project will be a public demonstration of environmental and energy stewardship and will create the following smart growth and high performance building practice areas:

- Inspirational indoor theatre/teaching/day meeting space (12,000+sq ft)
- ♦ Interpretive exhibits on environmental responsibility
- Outdoor classrooms (1 ½ acres)
- Accommodations for outdoor community events and gatherings (amphitheatre, electrical, event vendor pads, circular path/road, seating, lighting, rest rooms)
- Memorial garden/plaza (1 ½ acres)
- Pavilions, shelters, and picnic areas (3,000 sq ft--2 acres)
- Expanded demonstration parking areas that are water permeable and minimize or eliminate water run-off (1½ acre)

Springbrook Nature Center has been in operation for over 25 years with use increasing exponentially in that time to approximately 180,000 visits per year. The Metropolitan Council's Regional Parks Policy Plan 2005 projects that by 2030 the number of households within a sixteen-minute drive to Springbrook Nature Center will increase by 25 percent to 250,000. This project will focus existing and projected high impact visitor use into the interpretive center building and improved areas around it which will significantly reduce the overuse impact on Springbrook's 127 acres.

Springbrook Nature Center impacts the local, regional, and state community in diverse areas. It preserves open space in an increasingly urban inner ring suburb. It is an attraction for businesses and families to locate and live in the north metro area, having an economic impact on property values. The National Audubon Society in November 2004 designated Springbrook Nature Center one of the first eight "Important Bird Areas" in Minnesota. The Blanding's turtle, a state threatened species, is found in Springbrook's wetlands. Improving the quality of Springbrook's impacted wetlands has recently been the focus of a multi-city six \-year Clean Water Partnership Grant project. his project improves water quality before the water leaves Springbrook Nature Center and enters the Mississippi River, just upstream from the St. Paul and Minneapolis city water intakes.

Schools and other groups from over 35 communities participate in environmental education programming at Springbrook each year. A TEA-21 funded trail corridor to be constructed during the winter of 2005-2006 will travel through Springbrook's northern boundary and main entrance. This trail will connect Springbrook with a nearby mass transit hub and existing regional

Fridley: Springbrook Nature Center SPRING Project

bike trails. Guest book signatures in recent years show visitors from over 300 Minnesota communities, all 50 states, and 60 foreign countries.

This project will allow Springbrook Nature Center to improve its services to the greater community and assure the sustainability of its well-recognized natural resource base in the face of long term increasing intense use. The resulting programs, spaces, and demonstration areas will serve a diverse cross section of community, business, family, and individual needs.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$5.63 million. Private sources will contribute \$2.815 million; the private funds will result from a fund drive.

Other Consideration

The city of Friday will own and operate the facility. Construction is expected to begin in April 2010 and end in February 2011.

Project Contact Person

Siah St. Clair, Director Springbrook Nature Center 6431 University Avenue Fridley, Minnesota 55432 Phone: (763) 572-3588

Fax: (763) 571-1287

Email: stclairs@ci.fridley.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Fridley: Springbrook Nature Center SPRING Project

| | E al adiam (I am I Barian) |
|-----|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% in private funds will match 50% in state funding, |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing environmental learning opportunties is an important state |
| | mission. However, the state role in funding local training facilities is |
| | unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The project is viewed as having primarily a regional significance. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Fridley City Council adopted a resolution of support on June |
| | 11, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | No; predesign is part of the funding request. |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$893,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Gaylord)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Gaylord and Sibley County

Project At A Glance

The city of Gaylord is requesting state funding assistance for three projects:

- ♦ \$493,000 for a street improvement project for a storm sewer piping system
- ♦ \$225,000 to rehabilitate the current library into Gaylord City Hall
- ♦ \$175,000 to plan, study pre-design and design water quality improvement holding ponds upstream from Lake Titlow

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Priority 1: 2008 Street Improvement

This request is for \$493,000 in state funding to pre-design, design, construct, furnish, and equip a new storm sewer piping system to re-route existing drainage entering directly into Lake Titlow to an existing storm water quality pond where the water can be treated and discharged to a ditch system located in the city of Gaylord, county of Sibley. This is part of an ongoing effort and long tern plan to improve the water quality of Lake Titlow. The storm sewers on the north side of town empty into the lake bringing in an enormous amount of nutrients to the water that is destroying the water quality. The city and its citizens have been working on measures to improve the lake for more than a decade. While the streets are being improved in this part of town, it was decided to also try to reroute the storm sewers to improve the lake water quality. It will also serve as an example to county residents that they need to do more to practice better conservation methods also. The lake is part of the watershed for the Minnesota River basin, which are listed as impaired waters.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the street improvement project is \$6.5 million. The city will contribute \$2.5 million from the sale of bonds. Sibley County will contribute \$550,000. In 2007, the city provided \$3 million from bonds sales.

Project Contact Person

The city of Gaylord Administrative Office (507-237-2338) is the point of contact, but Justin Black of SEH, Inc (507-237-2924) is familiar with the engineering aspects of the project.

Priority 2: Gaylord City Hall

This request is for \$225,000 in state funding to rehabilitate the current library into the Gaylord City Hall. This project has local and regional significance because of the following reasons:

Local Significance:

Located only 60 miles west of the Twin Cities' area, Gaylord has experienced considerable growth recently and is projected to continue modest growth in the future. Population figures below are from the U.S. Census Bureau and the Minnesota Demographer's office (projections).

| <u>Year</u> | Gaylord's Population | Percent Change |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| 1990 | 1,935 | 0% |
| 2000 | 2,279 | 17.8% |
| 2010 | 2,536 (projection) | 11.3% |

Gaylord's Hispanic population grew to 17.4 percent in 2000. This is higher than the national percentage of 12.5 percent and much higher than Minnesota's percentage of 2.9 percent.

Because of the population growth and changing demographics, it is increasingly difficult for the library to fulfill its mission in its current location – only 3,300 square feet. A Library Needs Assessment showed that in order to adequately serve the population and demographics it should be 7,300 square feet – more than double existing size. It is inaccessible to those who have physical disabilities, the limited space inhibits expanding its collection, including increasing Spanish-language and children's materials, and

inadequate space for functional services and staff operations. The library sees high levels of use, especially by children and Hispanic residents.

The proposed project will allow the library and the city hall to swap buildings. Each will have to be renovated to accommodate the new use. The city hall conversion into the new library received a Construction Library Grant from the Minnesota Department of Education in 2006. The city of Gaylord needs assistance in converting the old library into the new city hall. The main reason for the swap is to better accommodate the needs of the library and its users. City hall does not have needs for its existing 7,300 sq. ft. and can fit well into the current library's space of 3,300.

Regional Significance:

Gaylord is the largest city in Sibley County and is the county seat. For all practical purposes it is the regional hub of this area and providing services to this growing region is taxing for this rural community. The Gaylord Library provides service to the city of Gaylord and the surrounding area. The Gaylord Public Library is part of the Traverse des Sioux (TdS) Regional Library System. The Gaylord Public Library started providing services in November 1976. Since 1985, it has been in the 3,300 square foot former Citizen State Bank building, which was built in 1920. The proposed project includes a building swap – the city hall will become the new library and the library will become the new city hall.

This request is to assist in financing for rehabilitating the existing library into the new city hall so that the existing library can be renovated to be the new library. The Minnesota Department of Education found this project to be significant enough that it provided a Library Construction Grant to renovate city hall into the library. This project – turning the library into the city hall – will bring both projects to fruition.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the city hall project is \$450,000. The city will contribute \$225,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Gaylord will own, operate and fully maintain the facility.

Since this is an existing building that will be remodeled, sustainable building designs will be adhered to the extent that it is feasible. Since we are in the programming stage, and the final building design has not been started, specific methods have not been determined but emphasis will be placed on commissioning, site issues, indoor air quality, and energy savings. In an effort to minimize life-cycle costs rather than just look at the initial capital outlay, materials and methods that allow a 10-year payback will be considered.

Project Contact Person

Lori Waltz, Acting City Administrator City of Gaylord 428 Main Avenue Gaylord, Minnesota 55334-0987 Phone: (507) 237-2338

Fax: (507) 237-5121

Unprioritized Project: Lake Titlow Watershed Planning Improvement Project

This request is for \$175,000 in state funding to pre-design, design, plan, and study the concept of water quality improvement holding ponds upstream from Lake Titlow.

The design will include the best location for the ponds, an estimated cost of land acquisition for easements, construction costs of the holding ponds, and the estimated expense of maintaining the structure(s), and who will be responsible for the expense. Funds will also be used to perform water quality tests and flow checks on the Lake Titlow watershed. The city must also coordinate with state and county conservation officials to ensure correct conservation practices and improvements in the watershed district. This is part of an ongoing effort and long term plan to improve the water quality of Lake Titlow. The ditches on the north and west side of town empty into the

lake which brings in an enormous amount of nutrients and sediment to the water which in turn is destroying the water quality. The city and its citizens have been working on measures to improve the Lake Titlow Watershed for more than a decade. This project will also serve as an example to county and area residents that they need to do more to practice better conservation methods. The lake is part of the Minnesota River watershed basin, which is listed as impaired water. We have also entered into a partnership with Minnesota State University-Mankato to assist with this project. The Science and Engineering Departments have been working with us for the past three years on a volunteer basis.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$175,000.

Other Considerations

Ownership and operation will rest with the city of Gaylord.

Project Contact Person

The city of Gaylord (Jim Swanson, 507-964-8235) is the point of contact, but Justin Black of SEH, Inc (507-237-2924) is familiar with the engineering aspects of the project.

Governor's Recommendations

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 38% of project costs are to be provided from local | |
| | government funds. | |
| | Priority 2: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local | |
| | government funds. | |
| | Unranked Project: None of the project costs are to be provided from | |
| | local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priority 1: The state has an existing grant program to provide | |
| | financial assistance in this area. | |
| | Priority 2: The state mission in funding these types of local projects is unclear. | |
| | Unranked Project: The state has an existing grant program to provide | |
| | financial assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| J. | Priorities 1 and 2: These projects are viewed as having primarily a | |
| | local benefit. | |
| | Unranked Project: This project is viewed as having primarily a local | |
| | benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: No. | |
| | Unranked Project: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | Priority 1: No. | |
| | Priority 2: The state role in funding these types of municipal buildings | |
| | is unclear and has varied from year to year. | |
| | Unranked Project: No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? All projects: The number of these types of local requests suggests | |
| | that additional requests will be forthcoming from local units of | |
| | government if the state provides funding for these projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| ' . | Priority 1: Not significantly. | |
| | Priority 2: No. | |
| | Unranked Project: Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: Yes, the Gaylord City Council adopted a | |
| | resolution of support on August 15, 2007. | |
| | Unranked Project: Not yet received. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | No. | |

Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?
Priority 1: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities.
Priority 2: Predesign is not required for local government projects where the construction costs are less than \$1.5 million.
Unranked Project: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities.

Project Scoring

Gilbert: Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$861,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Gilbert)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Gilbert, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Gilbert requests \$860,600 for wastewater treatment facility improvements.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Gilbert is requesting \$860,600 for the Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements project. This funding will be used for construction to complete the project.

The improvements planned for the Gilbert Wastewater Facility are based on the January 2004 Wastewater Facility Plan and recommendations from the city of Gilbert operators in 2005.

A brief description of each improvements and estimated total project cost follows:

| <u>Description</u> | Cost |
|--|-----------|
| Influent Structure Improvements | \$225,000 |
| Blower House Improvements | 7,800 |
| Control House Improvements | 123,500 |
| Primary Clarifier Improvements/Expansion | 379,700 |
| Trickling Filter Improvements | 190,000 |
| Aeration Structure Improvements | 181,000 |
| Final Clarifier Improvements/Expansion | 383,300 |
| Tertiary Filter Improvements | 134,000 |

| Description | Cost |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Chlorination Tank Improvements | 43,800 |
| Anaerobic Digester Improvements | (Included in Control House) |
| Alum Storage Improvements | 23,500 |
| Overflow Holding Tank Improvements | 7,500 |
| Site Work | 22,100 |
| Total | \$1 721 200 |

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$1,721,280. The city of Gilbert will pay 50 percent of the total cost.

Other Considerations

The city of Gilbert will own and operate the facility. Construction on the project is expected to begin July 2008 and end August 2009.

Project Contact Person

The Honorable Donald Bellerud Mayor, City of Gilbert PO Box 548 Gilbert, Minnesota 55741

Phone: (218) 748-2232 Fax: (218) 748-2234

Email: N/A

Governor's Recommendations

Gilbert: Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1 | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| _ | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | No. Minutes of the May 15, 2007 Gilbert City Council meeting have |
| | been provided. At this meeting the Council agreed to have the City |
| | Engineer submit applications for grants to continue the city's |
| | Wastewater Improvement Project. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | soparation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Glencoe: Morningside Avenue Upgrade to CSAH

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,250,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Glencoe)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Glencoe, in McLeod County

Project At A Glance

The city of Glencoe requests \$1.25 million in state funds to make improvements to Morningside Avenue

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1.25 million in state funding to acquire nine single-family residential units in order to make improvements to Morningside Avenue that will upgrade this roadway to County State Aid Highway (CSAH) status. This project has local, regional and statewide significance because of the following reasons:

The Morningside Avenue corridor will be burdened by increasing amounts of local and regional traffic with a new crossing of Buffalo Creek and planned commercial developments. The current corridor is deficient to accommodate these future needs. North of Highway 212, two major commercial tenants are moving to the Morningside Avenue and 11th Street intersection. South of Highway 212, the new Buffalo Creek crossing is expected to attract additional trips to Morningside Avenue since there is only one other local crossing of the creek in this area. An immediate need for infrastructure improvements is emerging on the Morningside corridor considering these developments. Morningside Avenue needs to be able to handle the increased traffic demands and structurally support truck traffic, which it is not subjected to today.

In order to successfully bring the Morningside project to fruition, nine single-family residential homes need to be purchased – these nine driveways need to be eliminated in order to carry out the long range plan for the Morningside Avenue corridor. Glencoe conducted a public meeting regarding the plans for this area and approximately 60 people attended and about half of the nine single-family home owners attended. Comments heard from these property owners were that they did not want to remain living on this increasingly busy road. They mentioned forming an association in order to sell their homes in one "block." They appear to be willing sellers. They want honest and open communication, which is what the city has been providing.

Glencoe is the county seat of McLeod County and has seen steady population growth in the last 15 years. Glencoe and McLeod County commissioned a traffic study to analyze current and future traffic conditions of the Morningside Avenue corridor and other adjacent roadways. The study concluded that the long-range plan for Morningside, in order to accommodate increased traffic and function well with neighboring Trunk Highway 212 and CSAH 15, is ultimately to convert Morningside into a 4-lane divided CSAH. This will be constructed in stages (please see enclosed Morningside Avenue Study). TH 212 is a major transportation corridor in this region, with Annual Average Daily Traffic westbound of 10,700 and eastbound of 5,300 (MN DOT's 2006 Traffic Volume Map).

Part of the project, as described in the study, includes changes to TH 212 frontage road. The frontage road south of TH 212 needs to be converted to have right in/right out access to/from Morningside Avenue. The southbound queue in the left lane will have an average of 3 vehicles waiting for a gap and a maximum queue of 9-10 vehicles, which will have an impact on the traffic operations of the TH 212 and Morningside intersection. The northbound approach to TH 212 will have a greater impact on the frontage road access; the northbound queue has an average of 10-12 cars in each of the two through lanes with the queue routinely extending beyond the frontage road creating major delay times and a safety concern.

Without the proposed infrastructure improvements, the negative impacts on TH 212 are great – creating congestion and a major safety concern. TH 212 is a major regional corridor that effectively gets people and products to their destinations. If nothing is done in this corridor, TH 212's effectiveness greatly diminishes, adding time and money to trips in this area. As well as in

Glencoe: Morningside Avenue Upgrade to CSAH

increase in pollution and emissions as cars line up waiting to make movements at the Morningside/TH 212 intersection.

This project furthers the 2003 Transportation Partnership Study. Representatives from the City of Glencoe, McLeod County, Mn/DOT and TC and W Railroad participated in that study. Again, the nine homes need to be purchased in order to make this project happen and maintain the effectiveness of State Trunk Highway 212.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$2.5 million. The city of Glencoe will contribute \$250,000; McLeod County will contribute \$250,000; and the federal government is expected to contribute \$750,000 to the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Glencoe and McLeod County will jointly purchase and own the land and the right-of-way.

Project Contact Person

Mark Larson, City Administrator 630 10th Street East Glencoe, Minnesota 55336-2137

Phone: (320) 864-5586 Fax: (320) 864-6405

Email: mlarson@ci.glencoe.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Glencoe: Morningside Avenue Upgrade to CSAH

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| <u> </u> | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Transportation and economic development are is an important state | |
| | mission. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors | |
| | are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Glencoe City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | June 18, 2007, and the McLeod County Board adopted a resolution | |
| | of support for the request on June 19, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, | |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. | |
| | | |

Gonvick: Northern Emergency Training Admin Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Gonvick)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Gonvick, in Clearwater County

Project At A Glance

The city of Gonvick requests \$2 million for the construction of an emergency training administration center.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2 million in state funding to design, construct, furnish, and equip an emergency training administration center in Gonvick, Minnesota for emergency first responders (i.e. law enforcement, hazardous materials/bio-chemical threats, fire departments, emergency medical services, and communications/technology). The center will provide a collective unit of emergency information, expertise, and simulation to provide instruction per prevention, intervention, response, mitigation, and recovery due to natural disasters or terrorist acts. Its purpose in particular is to encourage, stimulate, and maintain excellence in first responder performance. Gonvick's Northern Emergency Training Administration Center program (NETAC) will assist first responders serving 26 northern counties in Minnesota, and other localities as deemed appropriate, to enhance their professional knowledge and to improve their skills and abilities to meet current Minnesota Homeland Security guidelines and recommendations.

Everyday terrorism takes its toll through violence, injury, and death. Natural disasters are of equal threat. And illicit drugs, such as methamphetamine manufactured in Mexico, are smuggled into the United States via the U.S./Canadian border. In northern Minnesota, due to limited first responder training and support, our defenses and domestic preparedness may be in

question. This region remains one of the most vulnerable opportunities to threat in our state. NETAC of Gonvick, Minnesota, which is centrally located within the 26 county area, is needed more in northern Minnesota than any other part of our state or for that matter our northern U.S. region.

Per the state of Minnesota Homeland Security Strategy and Assessment of January 2004, state and local levels of government have primary responsibility for organizing, preparing, and operating the emergency services that would respond in the event of a terrorist attack. Local units of government are the first to respond, and the last to leave the scene. All incidents are ultimately local events!"

With primary responsibility of emergency services, state and local governments are also accountable to transmit information, expertise, simulation, and to enhance maintenance of excellence in emergency first responder performance. Training in prevention, intervention, response, mitigation, and recovery, due to natural disasters or terrorist acts is essential.

However, for the northern 26 counties of Minnesota, first responders do not have access to a regional, full-service, centrally located training facility. For the most part, these northern Minnesota counties must rely on training facilities well beyond their local counties. Small-town budget factors in northern Minnesota, as well as the issue of travel time, impair extended-distance training and support. Accordingly, this problem or crisis per limited first responder training begs the question Is the northern region of Minnesota adequately prepared to meet any natural disaster and/or act of terrorism that may occur?" Or, is this observable weakness in our defenses and our preparedness vulnerable to exploitation?

In accordance with its operational plan, NETAC will help train emergency first responders to meet and exceed the concept of 'domestic preparedness' for its 26 northern Minnesota counties. In support of the plan, the city of Gonvick will provide city real estate property (lots #14 ~ #19) to construct one four-story fire tower and a single one-story complex totaling about 20,000 square feet. The facilities will accommodate NETAC's proposed classroom training, simulation, and field experience programs and activities. Per its vision and mission, the organization is dedicated to producing and training a highly qualified and motivated emergency first responder committed to the protection of citizens and property from the impact of natural disasters or

Gonvick: Northern Emergency Training Admin Ctr

terrorist acts. As recommended by the findings of the Minnesota Homeland Security Strategy and Assessment of 2004, instruction and training in prevention, intervention, response, mitigation, and recovery, due to natural disasters or terrorist acts, is essential to emergency first responders quality performance.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$4 million before project escalation. Using the Department of Finance calculation for cost escalation adds 9.36%, or \$374,000, to the overall cost of the project. The federal government is expected to contribute \$1.7 million of the total cost. Private funding sources will provide \$300,000.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by the city of Gonvick. The Gonvick Fire Department will operate the facility. Construction is expected to begin on July 2008 and end on July 2009.

Project Contact Person

Wayne Hotchkiss, LSW 57568 County Highway #58 New York Mills, Minnesota 56567 Phone: (218) 385-3675

Fax: (815) 377-2111 Email Hotchkiss@arvig.net

Governor's Recommendations

Gonvick: Northern Emergency Training Admin Ctr

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding | |
| | sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission | |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local | |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| _ | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission | |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| 0. | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | The degree to which the project competes with other facilities | |
| | depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic | |
| | service area. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | The Board of Directors of NETAC adopted a resolution in support of | |
| | the project on June 20, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Not yet; predesign is part of the funding request for the project. | |

Grand Marais: Creechville Utility Extension Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$428,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Grand Marais)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Grand Marais, in Cook County

Project At A Glance

The city of Grand Marais requests \$428,158 to provide municipal utilities to the Creechville project area.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$428,158 which represents 50 percent of the estimated cost to provide municipal utilities to an annexed area of Grand Marais referred to as the Creechville project area. The Creechville area is comprised of 21 households. The estimated cost per household to provide municipal utilities is estimated to be \$40,777 per household. Individual property owners cannot afford the cost of improvements without funding assistance from state or federal sources.

The local significance of providing municipal utilities to the Creechville project area would be to eliminate health and safety issues associated with existing failing or non-conforming individual sewer treatment systems (ISTS). Additional significance results from the adverse economic impact of the improvements to project area residents — an estimated \$40,777 per household. Due to the geology of the area, costs are significantly higher to extend services to the area. The project area is located in the Lake Superior watershed and poses adverse environmental impacts to the area.

The regional significance of providing municipal utilities to the Creechville project area is the mitigation of health and safety issues associated with

failing or non-conforming ISTS's. The project area is located in the Lake Superior watershed and poses adverse environmental impacts to the area.

As mentioned above, the extension of municipal water and sewer utilities to the project area eliminates health and safety issues associated with failing or non-conforming ISTS's. The Creechville project area is located contiguous to Lake Superior, a valued local, regional, state and national resource. Each entity has a stake in preserving the environmental quality of this resource.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is 856,316. The city of Grand Marais will contribute 50 percent of the total project cost.

Other Considerations

The city of Grand Marais will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Mike Roth, City Administrator City of Grand Marais 15 North Broadway Grand Marais, Minnesota 55804-0600

Phone: (218) 387-1848 Fax: (218) 387-1966 Email: cityhall@boreal.org

Governor's Recommendations

Grand Marais: Creechville Utility Extension Project

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| _ | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Grand Marais City Council adopted a resolution of support |
| | on June 13, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | coparation projects, or water and wastewater racinities. |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,352,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Grand Rapids)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Grand Rapids, in Itasca County

Project At A Glance

The city of Grand Rapids requests state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$1,451,800 for the pre-design, design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a new Northern Minnesota Training Facility within the city of Grand Rapids
- \$900,000 to improve safety and reduce the closure times of its existing at-grade railroad crossings, including the at-grade crossing of Trunk Highway 169.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Northern Minnesota Regional Training Facility

This request is for \$1,451,800 in state funding for the pre-design, design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a new northern Minnesota training facility within the city of Grand Rapids. The purpose of this project is to provide a state of the art training facility for all emergency service providers in northern Minnesota that is more economically and more efficiently located for agencies in northern Minnesota.

The Grand Rapids Fire Department as a state contracted provider of chemical assessment mitigation has determined a need for a Northern Minnesota Training Facility for all emergency response agencies in northern Minnesota.

This project has become a higher priority item for the emergency service providers of northern Minnesota as the potential for disastrous events continue to grow. With major highways and railroads passing through northern Minnesota, the potential for major emergency disasters is high. Major waterways such as the Mississippi River pose great targets for chemical disasters that could greatly affect the environmentally sound areas of Minnesota.

The planning process has determined that the Northern Minnesota Regional Training Facility should be located at the Itasca County seat, city of Grand Rapids. This is the central location of northern Minnesota from the western border to the eastern border of Minnesota, and the northern border of Minnesota and Canada. The planning process also determined that the local hotels and food establishments would be sufficient to support the needs in this area to provide large training or emergency events hosted by this training facility.

The facility will have a three-fold mission:

- ♦ To provide a venue for various emergency response agency training from a state, regional, county and local perspective, sponsored by the state and city emergency response agencies.
- To address the response risk of northern Minnesota in the areas of chemical assessment mitigation, environmental emergencies and fire protection.
- ◆ To provide the increased space needs of the fire service and state funded chemical assessment team of Minnesota and the equipment acquisitions for these services. The building will house the state chemical assessment haz-mat truck and trailer, the river defense trailer, and all the mitigation equipment and supplies for mitigation and training. The building will also house the mobile training props such as: fire and inclement weather safety house, fire burn training trailer, mobile air training trailer, and swift water rescue equipment with a rescue deployment craft (RDC) and accessories.

The project has state, county and local significance due to the following reasons:

 State: Contract commitment to the state of Minnesota for the housing of the chemical assessment team and equipment for mitigation and containment of hazardous material accidents in the state of Minnesota.

More importantly, the training that this team can provide to all the emergency agencies of northern Minnesota on their roles as emergency responders to hazardous chemical events.

- County/Regional: Commitment to the Itasca County Chief's Association Mutual Aid Agreement between 16 Itasca County departments and two Aitkin County departments, as well as contract fire protection agreements with townships of Itasca County. Also, commitment to provide emergency response services for the Grand Rapids/Itasca County Airport.
- City/Local: Address the facility deficiencies needed to provide the expected training desires of emergency service agencies of Minnesota.

The facility will be managed by the Grand Rapids Fire Department, a department of the city of Grand Rapids, with the assistance of the state funded chemical assessment team, as long as the team is in existence. The operating costs will be borne by the city of Grand Rapids and offset by contract service fees.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$2,903,600. The city of Grand Rapids plans to issue municipal bonds for the non-state funds.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The operating costs will be borne by the city of Grand Rapids and offset by contract service fees.

Priority 1: Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by the city of Grand Rapids. The facility will be managed by the Grand Rapids Fire Department; a department of the city of Grand Rapids, with the assistance of the state funded chemical assessment team, as long as the team is in existence.

The project will utilize the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines (MSBG) as a guide to which all design decisions will be referenced. The goal of the project is to focus on maximizing energy efficiency through thermal performance of the building envelope as well as reductions in electrical and gas usage by specifying higher efficiency lighting systems (i.e. high-bay fluorescent light fixtures in the vehicle storage areas, occupancy sensors and

photocell sensors to control light fixtures and the incorporation of natural (cool) day-lighting to minimize the need for artificial lighting and also to reduce the cooling load for air conditioning. Fossil fuel usage will be reduced by the incorporation of heat recovery systems for office areas and tempering of fresh air introduction into the vehicle storage areas which will have a higher air exchange rate. Mechanical systems will be located internally to improve Life Cycle performance as well as improved maintainability.

Project Contact Person

Mr. Ron Edminister Facilities Maintenance Lead 420 North Pokegama Avenue Grand Rapids, Minnesota 55744

Phone: (218) 326-7628 Fax: (218) 326-7608

Email: redminister@ci.grand-rapids.mn.us

Priority 2: CP 2003-6 Railroad Crossing Closures/Improvements

The city of Grand Rapids is seeking \$900,000 in state funding to improve safety and reduce the closure times of its existing at-grade railroad crossings, including the at-grade crossing of Trunk Highway 169. The most feasible option is to reduce the closure times of these intersections and to increase the head-end speed of the train. The average closure time with a train speed of 12 miles per hour (mph) is two minutes. By increasing the train speed to 25 mph, the closure will be reduced to 58 seconds. There are currently three at-grade crossings that do not have signals and cross arms. The options for improving safety at these intersections are to either close the crossings, or have signals and cross arms implemented. In addition the city desires to complete preliminary design of an underpass of the railroad at the intersection of 7th Avenue Northeast.

The city is proposing to close the three at-grade crossings that currently do not have signals and cross arms, and they plan to up-grade the fourth crossing with a new turn lane and cross arms. Due to the street closures at 3rd Avenue East and 5th Avenue East, 3rd Street Southeast will need to realigned to connect to 7th Avenue Southeast. This will require the acquisition

of two properties. State funding is critical and necessary to accomplishing the project goals.

These railroad improvements are necessary to improve safety and traffic flow within the city of Grand Rapids. It will become more apparent that these crossings have specific issues when the Mesaba Energy project and the Minnesota Steel project move forward. Earlier in this application it was stated that the average time of closure with a train speed of 12 mph was two minutes. With these new industries the closure time would increase to eight minutes, four seconds with an 8,000 foot long train. By closing crossings and increasing train speeds to 25 mph, the closure times would reduce to four minutes, eight seconds.

The proposed improvements have the most impact on safety and traffic flows throughout the community and the entire region, including State Trunk Highway 169 and Trunk Highway 2. The project proposes to close or upgrade three non-signalized crossings, and close an additional signalized crossing. By removing and upgrading these intersections, the safety of these crossings will be greatly improved. In addition, the project would include preliminary design of an underpass of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad at the intersection of 7th Avenue Northeast. When constructed, it would provide uninterrupted traffic flow when trains passed through the community.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the railroad crossing project is \$3.373 million. Seventy five point five percent (75.5 percent) of the total project cost has been secured with commitments from the city of Grand Rapids, federal government, Iron Range Resources, and Burlington Northern Santa Fe.

Other Considerations

The proposed improvements would be owned and operated by the city of Grand Rapids.

Project Contact Person

Tom Pagel, P.E., City Engineer 420 North Pokegama Avenue Grand Rapids, Minnesota 55744

Phone: (218) 326.7626 Fax: (218) 326.7621

Email: tpagel@ci.grand-rapids.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Regional Training Facility:50% of project costs are to be provided | |
| | from local government funds. | |
| | Rail Crossing: 73% of project costs are provided from non-state | |
| | funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Regional Training Facility: Providing public safety training facilities is | |
| | an important state mission in Minnesota. However, the degree to | |
| | which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is | |
| | unclear. | |
| 3. | Rail Crossing: Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| ٥. | Regional Training Facility: This project is viewed as having primarily | |
| | a regional benefit. | |
| | Rail Crossing: Rail crossing safety is an important state mission. | |
| | However, the extent to which local crossing improvements are a | |
| | state versus local versus railroad funding responsibility is unclear. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Regional Training Facility: No. | |
| | Rail Crossing: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Regional Training Facility: The degree to which the project competes | |
| | with other facilities depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic service area. | |
| | Rail Crossing: Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| 0. | Yes, the Grand Rapids City Council adopted resolutions of support in | |
| | June and July of 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | For priority #1, predesign funding is part of the request for state | |
| | funds. | |
| | For priority #2, predesign is not required for this type of project. | |

Grand Rapids EDA: North Central Technology Lab

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,165,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Grand Rapids EDA)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Grand Rapids, in Itasca County

Project At A Glance

The Grand Rapids Economic Development Authority requests \$6,165,250 in state funding to assist with creating the North Central Technology Laboratories.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The purpose of this initiative is to create the North Central Technology Laboratories (NCTL), a world-class collaborative research and technology innovation program and center located in the heart of north central Minnesota. Its purpose is to improve the competitive position of the region's natural resource products industry by facilitating growth through training and research; boosting business growth by advancing bio-based innovations; and stimulating partnerships between local industry, state academic and research institutions, and government entities. The primary focus of activities at this facility will be in support of next-generation biofuels research and development, and workforce training and education for natural resource based industry. Prospective collaborators exploring feasibility include UPM-Blandin Paper Company (UPM), Itasca Community College (ICC), the University of Minnesota (U of M), Itasca Technology Exchange (ITE), Itasca County, and the city of Grand Rapids.

The initiative seeks to create a program with facilities to:

• Expand emerging workforce development programs.

- Provide pilot-scale, early commercialization facilities for biofuels development.
- Provide incubation space and support services for companies developing innovations in biofuels and other natural-resource-based research.
- Encourage and facilitate collaborative research with other institutions.
- Establish a regional economic development hub.
- ♦ Establish the Grand Rapids area as a national or regional Forest Policy and Planning Center.

The NCTL facility and program has the potential to dramatically impact the economic vitality of north central Minnesota by:

- Enabling innovative research and product development.
- Diversifying the economic base through the creation of new industries and companies.
- Increasing the utilization of renewable natural resources.
- ♦ Enabling the creation of better paying jobs (i.e. research, development, production, and administrative positions that require bachelor's and advanced degrees).

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$15,511,900. The federal government will contribute \$2.5 million; Iron Range Resources will provide 1.5 million; and the private sector will contribute \$5,346,650.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The Grand Rapids Economic Development Project received funding from the state in 2006 for completion of a planning and feasibility analysis associated with the NCTL project.

Other Considerations

Facility will be owned by the Grand Rapids Economic Development Authority and operated under a joint powers agreement of the participating partnering entities.

Grand Rapids EDA: North Central Technology Lab

Project Contact Person

Kirk Bustrom
Project Coordinator
NCTL Steering Group
201 NW Fourth Street
Grand Rapids, Minnesota 55744

Voice: (218) 326-5828 Fax: (218) 327-8879 Mobile: (218) 259-8416

Email: kbustrom@itascatech.com

Governor's Recommendations

Grand Rapids EDA: North Central Technology Lab

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 60% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? No. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Not yet received. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? No. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Predesign funding was previously appropriated and is currently in progress. | |

Grand Rapids PUC: Wastewater Treatment Facilities

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$8,750,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Grand Rapids PUC)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Grand Rapids, in Itasca County

Project At A Glance

The Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission requests \$8.750 million in state funding for reconstruction of its wastewater treatment facility.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The GRPUC requests \$8,750,000 in state funding for the reconstruction of its wastewater treatment facility (WWTF). The funds will be used in conjunction with expected outside federal funding (USACE and EPA) to add new sludge dewatering facilities, a new flow equalization basin, aeration enhancements to include upgrade to fine-bubble diffusion and selector technology, and primary and secondary clarifier improvements.

The WWTF are owned and operated by the GRPUC. The WWTF are currently treating industrial wastewaters from UPM/Blandin Paper Company and domestic/commercial waste from the cities of Grand Rapids, La Prairie and Cohasset, and approximately 40 million gallons of septage per year from the counties of Itasca, Cass and Aitkin. The WWTF consist of three separate and distinct facilities. The first is a 1963 Domestic WWTF which was decommissioned in 1976 and its flow diverted to the Secondary WWTP. The second is an Industrial Primary WWTF built in1969. The third is a Secondary WWTF build in 1975. Throughout the 1980s, 1990s and into the 2000s these facilities have been continuously operational and have been maintained or upgraded to stay in compliance with their NPDES operating permit. In general, these facilities had an original design life of 20 years and the

GRPUC is proud to have been able to extend their useful life an average of 10 years longer.

UPM/Blandin Paper Company (Headquarters in Helsinki, Finland) is preparing to add a new complete paper manufacturing line and modify another existing paper manufacturing line at its Grand Rapids, Minnesota, Paper Mill (Mill). This expansion is known locally as the Thunderhawk Project. The paper processing capacity at the existing Mill will increase by more than 50 percent, from approximately 446,605 tons per year to an estimated 761,000 tons per year. Anticipated construction costs for the Thunderhawk Project are in the \$700-800 million range.

This Project is required for a number of reasons including (1) the Thunderhawk Project, (2) the age and useful life of some process equipment and buildings, (3) the lack of redundancy of critical treatment units, (4) the existing WWTF's inability to continue to meet NPDES imposed mass loading discharge limits and (5) expected new water quality requirements being placed on its upper Mississippi River discharge. Regardless of the outcome of the Thunderhawk Project, over 50 percent of the proposed WWTF improvements will be required to provide a reasonable level of treatment process reliability and redundancy to sustain current operations at the mill and to extend the WWTF useful life for another 20 years. The current WWTF has been rated as Minnesota's fifth largest, and Minnesota's second largest biosolids generator.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$17.5 million. Up to \$8 million of the total will come from the federal government, and the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission will contribute the rest of the funds.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned and operated by the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission.

Grand Rapids PUC: Wastewater Treatment Facilities

Project Contact Person

Anthony T. Ward, General Manager Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission 500 SE 4th Street

Phone: (218) 326-7024 Email: atward@grpuc.org

Governor's Recommendations

Grand Rapids PUC: Wastewater Treatment Facilities

| Entrate of the IB date | |
|---|--|
| Evaluation of Local Projects 1. To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| assistance in this area. | |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| No | |
| Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| No | |
| Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| state provides funding for this project. | |
| Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| Not significantly. | |
| Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| Yes, the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission adopted a | |
| resolution of support on May 24, 2007. | |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| requesting? | |
| Yes | |
| Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| been submitted? | |
| A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer | |
| separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| | |

Grove City: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,050,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Grove City)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Grove City, in Meeker County

Project At A Glance

The city of Grove City requests state funding for two capital projects, listed in priority order:

- \$2.140 million in state funding to pay for 50 percent of the construction of a new wastewater treatment facility
- \$910,000 in state funding to pay for 50 percent of the construction of a new water treatment facility, water production well, and critical water main replacement

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Descriptions

Priority 1: Wastewater Treatment Facility

This request is for \$2.14 million of state funding for the construction of a new wastewater treatment facility for Grove City, Minnesota. The total project cost of \$4.28 million will be used to construct a new mechanical treatment facility, complete with lab equipment, process piping, controls, generator and sludge treatment and storage. Within that total is also \$700,000 for necessary collection system upgrades.

This project has exceptional local significance, and there are two categories of need for state assistance with this project. They are: a) physical need; and b) financial need.

a) Physical Need: The current Grove City wastewater treatment facility is over 40 years old, and has doubled its design life expectancy. The facility is

still treating sewage to meet state standards, but the physical infrastructure is crumbling. Major components of the current facility include bar screen, oxidation ditch, clarifier, drying beds, disinfection and collection system.

b) Financial Need: Without additional assistance, the high cost for the chosen alternative for the current system will place an extreme financial burden on the citizens of Grove City. As the following shows, this project will force the average household in the city to be responsible for \$116 per month, for the next 20 years, just for this new wastewater treatment system. Even with 50 percent assistance, the additional per household cost will be \$58 per month:

Combined Total Capital Cost: \$4,280,000

Annual Debt Service: \$275,000 (Assumes 2.5%

over 20-years)

Annual O, M&R: \$114,000 Total Annual Cost: \$389,000

Total Annual Cost: \$389,000 Divided by 280 EDU' equals: \$1,389

Divided by 12 months equals: \$116 per EDU per month

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$4.28 million. The city will leverage \$2.14 in Rural Development funds to pay for 50 percent of the project cost.

Other Considerations

Grove City will own the facility. The Facility Plan has been submitted to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA). The project schedule would have the project start in April 2008 and be completed in June 2009.

State revolving loan fund is a possibility for financial assistance – the city has been placed on the MPCA's 2008 Project Priority List and IUP request is pending.

Grove City: Two Projects

Priority 2: Water Treatment Facility

This request is for \$910,000 in state funding for a total project price of \$1.821 million to design, construct, furnish and equip a new water treatment facility, water production well, and critical water main replacement for the city of Grove City. The city currently has no iron and manganese treatment causing the water to be frequently discolored and unusable for household purposes. The background iron concentrations in the water exceed the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Secondary Drinking Water Contaminant Standards of 0.30 mg/L by nearly 8 times at 2.3 mg/L. The city will be raising the monthly water bills to cover the annual operation and loan share of this project.

This project is to be constructed simultaneously with an extensive wastewater treatment facility project. The combined water and wastewater monthly user fee is currently estimated at \$156 per user. This is significantly greater than the combined affordability of \$80 per month determined by state and federal finance agency calculations.

These are very important projects to the continued economic viability of the city of Grove City.

Sustainable Building Design: The building will be a low maintenance masonry building with very high insulation value cavity wall construction. The building heating and cooling will be provided primarily through ground water with no fossil fuel use or emissions. The building is primarily heated and cooled by the water flowing through, similar to a heat pump, with very limited natural gas used for supplemental backup heat.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the water treatment project is \$1.821 million. The remaining cost is proposed to be financed with federal U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development loan dollars.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. The city will be raising the monthly water bills to cover the annual operation and loan share of this project.

Other Considerations

The project schedule is to begin construction in May 2008 and complete construction in May 2009. The project pre-design has been submitted to the Department of Health, which is the regulatory agency for this type of project.

Project Contact Person (for both projects)

Janell Johnson,
City Administrator-Clerk
City Hall
PO Box 98

John Graupman,
Project Engineer
Bolton & Menk, Inc.
1960 Premier Drive

Grove City, Minnesota 56243-0098 Mankato, Minnesota 56001-5900

Phone: (320) 857-2322 Phone: (507) 625-4171 Fax: (320) 857-2322 Fax: (507) 625-4177

Email: cityofgrovecity@earthlink.net Email: johngr@bolton-menk.com

Governor's Recommendations

Grove City: Two Projects

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | Priority 1: 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding |
| | sources. |
| | Priority 2: 50% of project costs are provided from non-state funding |
| | sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Priority 1&2: The state has an existing grant program to provide |
| | financial assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | Priority 1&2: These projects are viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | Priority 1&2: No |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Priority 1&2: No |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | Priority 1&2: The number of this type of local request suggests that |
| | additional requests will be forthcoming from local units of government |
| | if the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Priority 1&2: Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Groce City City Council passed resolutions of support for |
| | each project on June 23, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| 40 | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Priority 1&2: A project predesign is not required for projects |
| | consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater |
| | facilities. |

Hamburg: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$334,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Hamburg)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Hamburg, in Carver County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$333,900 in state funding to provide the city of Hamburg with supplemental financing, leveraged with local funds to correct an immediate, serious sanitary sewer inflow and infiltration (I&I) problem.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$333,900 in state funding to provide the city of Hamburg with supplemental financing, leveraged with local funds to correct an immediate, serious sanitary sewer inflow and infiltration (I&I) problem. Hamburg's current wastewater treatment facility is near capacity and may have the need for immediate repairs.

Hamburg, in the near future, may need to make a substantial investment in alternative wastewater treatment options (new local treatment or regionalization), or complete substantial rehabilitation to the existing wastewater treatment stabilization ponds.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has previously issued Special Requirements upon the re-issuance of the city's National Pollution Discharge Elimination Permit (NPDS) in July 2005.

One Special Requirement, reduce the I&I. The MPCA stated that reduction of the I&I is necessary prior to any regionalization of wastewater treatment. Excess flows cause capacity issues and could affect Norwood Young America's phosphorus loading limits, potentially exceeding the Total

Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) for the Minnesota River. Due to the excess I&I, the option of regionalization wastewater treatment with Norwood Young America has been put on hold. Also, residential development within the city is at a standstill. Another Special Requirement, notify the MPCA of the city's intent to regionalize in writing, and provide plans and specifications for a regionalization project by August 2007 or conduct a water balance test. The city is in the process of completing a water balance test of its wastewater ponds.

Clear water is leaking into the city's sanitary sewer system though cracks, poor service connections, and defective joints in the sewer mains. The city has initiated a televising program to identify and remove direct plumbing connections to the system and identify other problem areas. The state funding will allow Hamburg to initiate the project to replace and repair the defective, sanitary sewer lines segments. The city's current proposal is to replace the sewer mains and some sewer services in an area located east of Brad Street between Park and Kim Avenues. In addition, storm sewer pipe segments would need to be extended to drain excess groundwater that was previously removed by the defective sanitary sewer pipes.

This project has both regional and local significance. Further negotiations with Norwood Young America concerning regionalization of wastewater treatment cannot proceed until the I&I problem is corrected. Locally, residential development within the city is stymied.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$667,800. Of this total, 50 percent is to be provided by the city of Hamburg, locally financed through special assessment, sewer enterprise funds.

Other Considerations:

City of Hamburg owns and operates the sanitary sewer collection and transport facilities. The project is planned to begin construction August 2008 and complete construction July 2009.

Hamburg: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement

Project Contact Person:

Douglas Parrott, P.E. Consulting City Engineer 310 Main Avenue West PO Box 776 Gaylord, Minnesota 55334-0776

Phone: (507) 237-2924 Fax: (507) 237-5516 Email: dparrott@sehinc.com

Governor's Recommendations

Hamburg: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Hamburg City Council passed a resolution of support on | |
| | June 26, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| ь | I askaman kasharat and mananana mananana | |

Hennepin County: Three Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$54,634,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Hennepin County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Various locations in Hennepin County

Project At A Glance

Hennepin County requests state funding for three capital projects (listed in priority order):

- ◆ \$24.167 million for the replacement of the Lowry Avenue Bridge spanning the Mississippi River on County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 153, in Minneapolis
- ♦ \$2.5 million for a new Heading Home Opportunity Center
- ◆ \$27.968 million for the Hennepin County Medical Center (HCMC) Outpatient Clinic and Health Education Facility

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Descriptions

Priority 1: Lowry Avenue Bridge Replacement

This request is for \$24.167 million in 2008 state funding for the replacement of the Lowry Avenue Bridge spanning the Mississippi River on County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 153 - in Minneapolis. The project is part of larger corridor project that has a western terminus of Xerxes Avenue and easterly limit of Stinson Boulevard. Bridge engineers have identified significant structural deficiencies requiring mitigating action. In 2004 the bridge was closed to traffic when it was discovered that a bridge pier located in the Mississippi River tilted out of alignment, causing the bridge to slip off its base at the top of the pier. The bridge was opened to traffic after new base assemblies were manufactured and installed. The bridge is nearly 100 years old with an obsolete design that allows salt and other contaminants to drop directly into the river. It is the largest bridge replacement project that remains

under Hennepin County jurisdiction, with a total replacement cost (including approach work and right of way acquisition) approaching ten times the county's annual transportation construction budget.

The bridge location provides a valuable link between a heavy industrial/ commercial and residential area. The replacement structure will address the environmental concern of the existing structure "open surface" that allows materials, such as salt laden snow and spilled liquids (fuel, paints, etc.) to fall directly into the Mississippi River below. As a major river crossing in the metropolitan area, the project is considered of regional importance.

Total Project Cost: The updated total cost of this bridge replacement project (including approach work and right of way acquisition) is \$109 million. County funds of \$12 million will contributed to the project, and the county is seeking \$70.3 million in federal funds for the project. (The total cost figure includes state bond funding of \$2.5 million that was provided in 2006.)

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$2.5 million in the 2006 Bonding Bill (Laws 2006, chapter 258, section 16, subdivision 2) was provided "to design replacement of the Lowry Avenue bridge carrying County State-Aid Highway 153 across the Mississippi River in Minneapolis."

Other Considerations

Hennepin County is the owner and operator of the bridge. Construction is anticipated to begin in October 2009 with completion in November 2011.

Project Contact Person

James Grube, Director of Transportation and County Engineer 1600 Prairie Drive

Medina, Minnesota 55340 Phone: (612) 596-0307

Fax: (763) 478-4000

Email: James.Grube@co.hennepin.mn.us

Hennepin County: Three Projects

Priority 2: Heading Home Opportunity Center

This request is for \$2.5 million in state funding for site acquisition, design, and development of Heading Home Opportunity Center(s) to provide a onestop shop model connecting people experiencing homelessness or at-risk of becoming homeless to the continuum of services needed to secure safe and stable housing. Development of one or more Opportunity Center(s) is one of the central recommendations of *Heading Home Hennepin*—the Hennepin County and city of Minneapolis 10-year plan to end homelessness. One-half of the long term homeless in Minnesota reside in Hennepin County and the *Heading Home Hennepin* plan is aligned with the goals of the state of Minnesota Business Plan to End Homelessness, as well as with other regional plans throughout Minnesota.

While the state of Minnesota, Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis have a wide array of services available to people experiencing homelessness, the Opportunity Center(s) will provide central access points, linking people to mainstream services and providing a more efficient and integrated delivery system to break the cycle of homelessness within our community. The Opportunity Center(s) will connect people experiencing homelessness to a range of co-located services including employment training and assistance, housing referrals, veterans services, medical and mental health care, substance abuse treatment, benefits assistance, and other specialized services for women and children.

The Opportunity Center(s) will be public / private / non-profit partnerships, both in funding and operations, modeled after the successful Minneapolis and St. Paul *Project Homeless Connect* events of the past year. In effect, the Opportunity Center would be *Project Homeless Connect* on an ongoing basis.

It is proposed that the Opportunity Center(s) be located in the city of Minneapolis. Several available properties are currently being evaluated for their viability. *Heading Home Hennepin* recommendations call for opening the Opportunity Center(s) in 2009.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Heading Home Opportunity Center project is anticipated to be \$10 million. In addition to the requested \$2.5 million in state funding, Hennepin County has committed \$2.5 million as part

of the county's 2007-2011 capital improvement plan. The Family Housing Fund has established a separate Partners Fund to raise private capital specifically for implementation of the state and local ten-year plans to end homelessness.

Other Considerations

Construction is anticipated to begin in 2008, with completion in 2009.

Project Contact Persons

Commissioner Gail Dorfman Hennepin County 300 South 6th Street – A2400 Minneapolis, MN 55487-0240 Phone: (612) 348-7883 Email:

Email: gail.dorfman@co.hennepin.mn.us

Cathy ten Broeke Coordinator to End Homelessness Minneapolis/Hennepin County 300 South 6th Street – A2308 Minneapolis, MN 55487-0238

Phone: (612) 596-1606 Email:

cathy.ten.broeke@co.hennepin.mn.us

Priority 3: Hennepin County Medical Center (HCMC) Outpatient Clinic and Health Education Facility

HCMC is owned by Hennepin County and is recognized for its mission as a safety net health care provider and for the role it plays in the education of physicians and other health professionals. Hennepin County requests that the HCMC Outpatient Clinic and Health Education Facility project be included in the 2008 state capital appropriations in the amount of \$27.968 million.

HCMC is a primary teaching affiliate hospital of the University of Minnesota, with more than 280 resident physicians in training and 90 medical students in clinical rotations. It is also the training site for more than 50 other health professions, including the annual training of 900 nursing students. Through the teaching clinics, HCMC provides access to health care for a substantial plurality of the state's uninsured and public program patients.

The outpatient/teaching clinics are and have been operating near capacity in recent years. Meanwhile, the educational space necessary for the teaching program (conference and auditorium space for didactic teaching sessions) is inadequate, and has recently been reduced (Pillsbury Auditorium) out of the

Hennepin County: Three Projects

necessity to provide additional space for patient service (e.g. the Acute Psychiatric Service). The square footage footprint for the Medical Center has not increased since the acquisition of the MMC facility in 1992, and the newest buildings on the HCMC campus are now 30 years old.

This project is important to the general welfare of the state. Giving the importance of health to our quality of life and the comparative shortage of physicians and other health professionals in the state, continuing to train physicians and other health professionals at HCMC is of vital importance. The ambulatory care/teaching clinics and educational facilities at HCMC are important to this effort. We have developed the concept for an ambulatory care building which is being designed to include space and configuration concepts adequate for teaching clinics. This requires an estimated 15 to 20 percent more space than is found in the private practice office setting. The portion of the total project that is fundamentally dedicated for teaching purposes is \$27.968 million. The \$27.968 million is specifically related to the education of physicians and other health professionals as follows:

 Teaching Clinics
 \$18,720,000

 Education Center
 9,248,000

 Total
 \$27,968,000

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$175.1 million. Of the total cost, county/HHS sources will fund \$146.883 million, or 84 percent, of the total project costs.

Project Contact Person

Lynn Abrahamsen, Administrator, Hennepin Healthcare System Hennepin County Medical Center 701 Park Avenue

Phone: (612) 973-2343

Email: Lynn.Abrahamsen@co.hennepin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

Hennepin County: Three Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|----------|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | For priorities #1 and #2, 75% of total project costs are to be provided | |
| | from nonstate funding sources. | |
| | For priority #3, 84% of total project costs are to be provided from | |
| | nonstate sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | For priority #1, transportation is an important state mission. The | |
| | state has existing grant programs to provide financial assistance for | |
| | local bridges. | |
| | For the priority #2 and #3 projects, the state mission in funding these | |
| | types of project is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | The priority #1 project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| | The priority #2 project is viewed as having primarily a regional, as | |
| | well as local, benefit. | |
| | The priority #3 project is viewed as having primarily a regional | |
| <u> </u> | benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| _ | No, not for any of the three requested projects. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? For priority #1, the state has funded a program for local bridge | |
| | bonding for many years. | |
| | For priority #2, the request is for an uncommon type of project; it | |
| | does not compare to most other submitted local capital funding | |
| | requests. | |
| | If priority #3 is funded, other local jurisdictions could seek funding for | |
| | healthcare facility remodeling projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | For priority #1, other state and local bridges also provide crossings of | |
| | the Mississippi River but do not serve the same purpose. | |
| | For priority #2, not significantly. | |
| | For priority #3, unclear. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners adopted a | |
| | resolution of support on June 26, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |

10. Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?
For priority #1, a project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways.
For priorities #2 and #3, predesigns have not yet been submitted to the Department of Administration.

Hennepin County RRA: Southwest Transitway

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$10,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority)

PROJECT LOCATION: Hennepin County (Eden Prairie to Downtown Mpls.)

Project At A Glance

The Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA) requests \$10 million in state funding for the Preliminary Engineering & Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Southwest Transitway Corridor.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA), as the local governmental entity leading the development of the proposed Southwest Light Rail Transit (LRT) line, requests that the Southwest Transitway Corridor Preliminary Engineering and Final Environmental Impact Statement be included in the 2008 State capital appropriations in the amount of \$10 million.

The Southwest Transitway is a proposed LRT line from Eden Prairie in southwest Hennepin County to downtown Minneapolis providing service to Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, Edina, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, and Minneapolis. It will also connect downtown Minneapolis to the system of existing and proposed transitways including the Hiawatha LRT line, Northstar Commuter Rail line, and the Central LRT line. The Southwest Corridor line is forecast to carry 23,500 to 28,000 passengers per day in year 2030. The estimated federal Cost-Effectiveness Index is \$30, which makes the Southwest Corridor project likely to qualify for federal New Starts funding.

The overall Southwest Corridor project has a total estimated capital of approximately \$1.2 billion (2015 dollars). It is assumed that the capital costs

for the Southwest LRT line will be funded based upon the rail transitways funding formula established by the Metropolitan Council and the Metro Area county regional railroad authorities, wherein the costs would be split as follows: 50 percent federal, 33 percent state, 17 percent local.

The HCRRA recently completed an Alternatives Analysis (AA), which resulted in a recommendation to proceed into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process in order to narrow the three candidate LRT routes to one. Once a single LRT route is selected it will be named the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and the project will move into Preliminary Engineering. The HCRRA anticipates that the DEIS will be completed by the end of 2008 and the project will be ready to enter Preliminary Engineering in early 2009.

Total Project Cost: There is an estimated \$30 to \$40 million cost to conduct Preliminary Engineering and prepare the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the overall project. What is being requested at this time is \$10 million in State bonding to cover the State's share of the Preliminary Engineering and FEIS.

Identified below are the current estimated costs associated with preliminary planning, DEIS, Preliminary Engineering and the FEIS and the funding sources for these phases of the project:

Cost Summary:

Preliminary Planning, DEIS, Prelim. Engineering, FEIS \$33,500,000

Funding:

 State (This 2008 request for State Bonding)
 \$10,000,000

 Federal
 \$16,000,000

 HCRRA
 \$7,500,000

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

Once the line is operation, which is projected for year 2015, state operating funds will be requested for 50 percent of the net operating costs with the remaining 50 percent provided by the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA).

Hennepin County RRA: Southwest Transitway

Other Considerations

It is assumed that additional state funds will be requested in 2010 and 2012 to move this project through Final Design and eventually through Construction/Operations. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2012 with a completion date of 2015.

Project Contact Person

Katie Walker, Transit Project Manager 417 North 5th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55410

Office: (612) 348-2190 Fax: (612) 348-9710

Email: Katie.walker@co.hennepin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Hennepin County RRA: Southwest Transitway

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 70% of project costs for preliminary engineering and environmental |
| | documentation are provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation and economic development is an important state |
| | mission. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and |
| | Mn/DOT are responsible for transportation planning and |
| | programming and prioritizing state and federal funding for |
| | transportation projects. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | The Southwest Transitway corridor would likely have operating costs |
| | that would need some state support if built. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | This project should be considered alongside the other transit plans |
| | and projects that are under discussion for the metropolitan area. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority Board adopted a |
| | resolution of support on June 26, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is likely not required for this type of project. |
| <u> </u> | |

Hibbing: Central Range Renaissance Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$25,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Hibbing)

PROJECT LOCATION: 800-acre Motorplex site between Hibbing &

Chisholm

Project At A Glance

The city of Hibbing is requesting \$25 million in state funding in 2008 to fund the state share of the costs of the Central Range Renaissance Project, which is an unprecedented regional effort to create a major new economic and civic engine benefiting Northern Minnesota. The focal point of the project will be construction of a multi-purpose facility and complex to provide numerous social and civic programs and services at a central location that no community can afford alone.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The original Hibbing Memorial funding request is part of The Central Range Renaissance Project (CRRP). The CRRP is an unprecedented regional effort that combines the unified energy of citizens representing the seven cities of the Central Iron Range to create a major new economic and civic engine benefiting Northern Minnesota. The focal point of the project will be construction of a multi-purpose facility and complex to provide numerous social and civic programs and services at a central location that no community can afford alone. It has been designed to develop new industry for the Range while also providing state-wide impact through substantial savings in Medicare and Medicaid outlay for senior citizens while developing permanent financial private funding to replace Mighty Ducks legislation. Anticipated private funding dollars that are contingent upon state participation are estimated at \$35 million. The Central Range Renaissance Center has four major components:

A new three sheet Range Renaissance Ice Complex provides the Central Range with a 12 ice sheet capacity at any given time. To support the complex, The North American Hockey Institute will develop an aggressive schedule of tournaments, camps, clinics, and championships resulting in increased tourism and economic impact. A National Hockey Foundation has been incorporated to provide permanent financial support to the complex, the US Hockey Hall of Fame Museum and to replace Mighty Ducks funding for distribution of funds to community programs throughout the state. Hibbing and Virginia colleges would offer two and four year degrees in sports management, facility management, sports medicine, and coaching certification. A National Hockey Prep High School and a sports medicine clinic are included and the US Hockey Hall of Fame Museum of Eveleth has been invited to act as "host" to the Foundation, Institute, and Ice Complex. Plans call for renovation of both the Hibbing Memorial and Virginia Miners Memorial arenas to host a Junior League Pro team.

To aid in attracting and retaining skilled, educated workers and families for the nearly 6000 job openings on the range over the next 5 years, additional components have been added to create a "destination activity" for range families and visiting tourist families. An aquatic water park, a competition athletic pool, a convention center, an amphitheater, and an indoor sports complex for baseball, basketball, soccer, tennis facilities and child daycare are included.

The Central Range Renaissance Project has been designed to accelerate other important economic development projects for the range. The CRRP hopes to be built at the 800 acre Hibbing / Chisholm Motorplex where it can serve as an anchor to promote this location as a tourist destination activity. Private developers have expressed interest in hotel, restaurant, and gaming additions to the site. They would be required to provide a stream of shared profits for operation of the Renaissance Center.

Total Project Costs: The total cost of this project is \$77 million -- \$50 million in 2008 and \$27 million in 2010. State funds of \$25 million in 2008 and \$5 million in 2010 will be combined with funding from several other sources -- Private: \$35 million, Regional: \$15 million, Federal \$5 million, development: \$15 million

Hibbing: Central Range Renaissance Project

Other Considerations

The complex will be managed by the Central Range Renaissance Complex Board of Directors. This will be a non-profit board that will hire a for-profit management group to form an association of the seven cities. The board will be composed of representatives from each town and civic organization that joins the project. The Ice Complex would be directly managed by the Hibbing Youth Hockey Association.

Project Contact Person

Robert Ballintine
Principal and Managing Associate
Compass Development, LLC
4620 West 56th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55424
Direct office line: (952) 929-9035
Mobile phone: (952) 201-0611
Email: roball@compdev.us

Governor's Recommendations

Hibbing: Central Range Renaissance Project

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? The \$25 million requested for 2008 will be matched with an equal amount of non-state funds. (The overall project cost is anticipated to be \$77 million, and the city expects that 60% of this total project cost will come from non-state sources.) | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? The state role in funding this large multi-purpose facility and complex project is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? The planned project is viewed as having a regional and local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No, none have been identified. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar multi-purpose projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Unclear at this time. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Not yet received. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Predesign funding is requested as part of the request for state funds. | |
| | | |

Houston County: Root River Trail Extension

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,641,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Houston County)

PROJECT LOCATION: From Houston Nature Center east to Mound Prairie

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1,641,000 in state funding in 2008 to acquire land, design and build the next section of the legislatively-authorized Root River Trail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1,641,000 in state funding in 2008 to acquire land, design and build the next section of the legislatively-authorized Root River Trail.

The purpose is to extend the existing Root River Trail from its terminus at the Houston Nature Center east to the village of Mound Prairie, through the scenic river valley. In the future, continue to city of Hokah and then connect to the Wisconsin trail system at La Crescent.

The existing length of the Root River Trail is nationally known. The new section parallels Minnesota Highway 16, a National Scenic Byway. Once connected to the trail system at La Crosse, Wisconsin and La Crescent, Minnesota, the two states' trail systems will be even more attractive to visitors because of their variety of scenery and amenities, length and scenic beauty. This trail can also connect to the planned national Mississippi River Trail running alongside the Great River Road.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the 2008 phase of the extension of the Root River State Trail is \$1,641,000.

 FY 2008
 FY 2010
 FY 2012

 Total Project Costs
 \$1,641,000
 \$1,246,000
 \$950,000

 Project Construction
 Spring 2009
 Spring 2011
 Spring 2013

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources will own and operate this trail. Operating funding would be included in the DNR trails operation budget.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This project received \$100,000 in the 2006 Bonding Bill.

Other Considerations

There is \$5,000 in nonstate funds available to be contributed to the project.

In 2010, for a subsequent phase of the project, a federal grant of \$545,000 has been awarded.

Project Contact Person

Tom van der Linden Chairman, Houston County Trails 30585 County Road 1 La Crescent, Minnesota 55947

Phone: (507) 643-6209

Email: koksetna@acegroup.cc

Governor's Recommendations

Houston County: Root River Trail Extension

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | A nominal amount of non-state funds (\$5 thousand) are to be | |
| | provided from non-state sources for the 2008 phase of the project. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Providing recreational opportunities via trails is an important state | |
| | mission in Minnesota. The state agency develops master plans for | |
| | all state trails and seeks a manageable level of state bond funding for | |
| | trails in each capital budget cycle. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | The trail project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Trails that are to be owned and maintained by DNR will increase | |
| | operating costs in the DNR budget. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| _ | See. #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Houston County Board adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | December 27, 2005. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of raods, | |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. | |

Hoyt Lakes, Town of White: Laskin Energy Park

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$881,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Hoyt Lakes)

PROJECT LOCATION: Hoyt Lakes & Town of White, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Hoyt Lakes and the Town of White are requesting \$881,267 in state funding in 2008 to complete the Laskin Energy Park Rail and Infrastructure Improvements Project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Hoyt Lakes and the Town of White are requesting \$881,267 in state funding in 2008 to complete the Laskin Energy Park Rail and Infrastructure Improvements Project.

The major public infrastructure component requiring state funding assistance is the construction of a 7,700 lineal foot railroad spur (1.46 miles) from the Canadian National main line just outside of Laskin Energy Park near the northwest corner of the park to Lot 1, Blocks 1 and 2 of the park. Initially, the spur will be designed to serve Lot 1, Block 2 but will have the ability to serve another six sites (approximately 105 acres) in Lot 1, Blocks 1 and 2.

The city of Hoyt Lakes and Town of White will prepare a 15 acre site for construction of a new 55,000 sq. ft. publicly owned manufacturing building, and are seeking state funds to extend existing municipal water and sewer utilities to the building, provide for storm water management and add a new business park interior access road that will serve the property. These infrastructure improvements will also be able to be extended to provide access and connections to public utilities to the neighboring six sites which include approximately 105 acres.

Construction of the spur will cost an estimated \$3.18 million dollars. The total projected cost for the supporting utility, storm water management and road infrastructure is \$581,386.

This is an important community project that will support the continued development, expansion and positioning of the Laskin Energy Park, the premier heavy industrial business park on the East Iron Range, and Tundra Particles Technologies (TIPCO), a new high tech manufacturing company. A state funding investment will leverage and support the development of a new rail spur providing siding access for TIPCO, which requires the rail for heavy shipments of tungsten to support its manufacturing process. In addition, a new access road and public utility extensions will allow us to take advantage of the opportunity for a new industry cluster based on outputs of this new company. TIPCO is projected to spur \$25 million in new private investment and create 80 new living wage jobs within the next five years. The proposed infrastructure will support this new business and open the undeveloped north park area for other new growth that can take advantage of rail and the other existing amenities at Laskin Energy Park. We are excited about this new opportunity and the interest by state and regional funders to help make this park expansion and the addition of TIPCO a reality. We are ideally situated to create a whole new industry cluster for the East Iron Range and Northeast Minnesota. State funding assistance is a critical part of this renewed effort to replace the jobs we have lost over the past five years and to support new job opportunities for residents of our surrounding distressed counties.

Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$3,762,534 for 2008. In addition to the 2008 request for \$881,267 in state bonding funds, the project will use a \$500,000 Greater Minnesota Business Public Infrastructure Grant for roads, utilities, and rail spur that was awarded in November 2006 by the Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED), as well as a \$500,000 Minnesota Investment Fund (MIF) loan/grant for infrastructure. Nonstate funds for the project include:

♦ St. Louis County Economic

Development Grant Fund: \$500,000
Iron Range Resources: \$1,300,000
City of Hoyt Lakes: \$81,267

No state funded is planned to be requested in either 2010 or 2012.

Hoyt Lakes, Town of White: Laskin Energy Park

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. The city of Hoyt Lakes and Town of White both commit that following completion of the proposed project, they will maintain the project site in good operating condition, appearance, and repair and protect the same from deterioration, reasonable wear and tear resulting from ordinary use of the property excepted for as long as the city and Town retain ownership of the project site.

Other Considerations

The owner of the Laskin Business Park property for which this project will be sited is the city of Hoyt Lakes, pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the property transfer from Minnesota Power. The rail spur will encompass 15.11 acres and will be located on public easement extending approximately 1.46 miles to be provided to the city of Hoyt Lakes and Town of White pursuant to the terms of the MOU.

Project Contact Person

Richard Bradford City Administrator 206 Kennedy Memorial Drive Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota 55750

Phone: (218) 225-2344 Fax: (218) 225-2485 Email: clerk@hoytlakes.com

Governor's Recommendations

Hoyt Lakes, Town of White: Laskin Energy Park

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|----------|---|--|
| _ | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding | |
| | sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if | |
| | the state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Hoyt Lakes City Council adopted a Resolution of Support on | |
| | June 21, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, | |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. | |
| <u> </u> | bridges, trails of patriways. | |

International Falls: Voyageurs Heritage Center

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$6,487,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (International Falls)

PROJECT LOCATION: International Falls, in Koochiching County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$6,487,386 in state funding for design, construction, furnishing and equipment for the proposed International Falls Voyageurs Heritage Center and Voyageurs National Park Headquarters.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$6,487,386 in state funding to be allocated for design, construction, furnishing and equipment for the proposed International Falls Voyageurs Heritage Center and Voyageurs National Park Headquarters.

This project is originally the idea of State Representative Irv Anderson. The State of Minnesota provided predesign funding for this project in 1997. The availability of federal funding is the result of the willingness of the National Park Service to partner on this project through a long-term lease of the new facility space for the Voyageur National Park Service headquarters and the use of Centennial Initiative Signature Project Program funding makes this project financially feasible at this time.

This new shared facility will be strategically located along the Rainy River within the city of International Falls on a reclaimed industrial property with a historical connection to the past of the Voyageurs North American trade route. This project is an effort to increase awareness of the National State Park system through the Centennial Initiative Signature Project Program "to engage all Americans in preserving our heritage, history and natural resources through philanthropy and partnerships, to reconnect people with

their parks, and build capacity for critical park operations and facilities, and sustain them through the next century." This creation of a multi-partner Voyageurs Heritage Center will become an information hub for sites along the Voyageur Highway and provide state-of-the-art exhibits to interpret the Voyageur history and significance, including the American Indian / First Nations peoples living in the region.

This signature project hails the efforts of past State Representative, Irv Anderson, in creating a gateway to the Voyageurs National Park; as well as providing the opportunity for the economic benefit to the local area in both tourism and sustainable job opportunities. In addition, the continued predesign efforts have rallied the support and vision of both local and state government, the National Park Service, and the local community and business district.

This project boasts a partnership which visions a sustainable, joint-use facility to become the focus for this site, and which will also become the impetus for the riverfront re-development of the adjacent riverfront sites which are currently under developer ownership. The new facility will become a model of sustainable design for an extreme northern location and will boast a building design which will provide a low-maintenance highly efficient facility.

The local and regional economic growth spurred from this facility development and the increased tourism traffic will enhance the local business community, as well as provide the opportunity for many National State Park jobs to remain in the region.

Through the collaborative efforts of the city of International Falls and the National Park Service, the goal is to provide an awareness and increased access to this local historical amenity and encourage visitor involvement at both the Voyageur National Park, the city of International Falls as well as the entire regional and state area.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project for 2008 is \$20,684,000. Of this total, 69 percent of the costs is planned to be funded with nonstate sources: city revenue bonds will contribute \$11,671,180; and federal Centennial Initiative funds have been requested that will provide another \$2,525,500.

International Falls: Voyageurs Heritage Center

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The city of International Falls will maintain sole ownership of the facility. A long-term lease will be established with the National Park Service for the dedicated new facility of the National Park Service Headquarters.

Operation and management of the facility will consist of a collaboration between multiple agencies, including the city of International Falls and the Voyageurs National Park Service. No state operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

Predesign was funded in 1997.

Other Considerations

Design of this new facility will utilize the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines (MSBG) as a minimum requirement for the project. The goal of the project, in collaboration with the National Park Service, is to achieve a Silver LEED rating awarded by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC).

The design of this facility will serve as a model for sustainable design in northern climates. Through a multi-disciplined design approach, research and utilization of design techniques will be incorporated which will maximize the energy efficiency of this facility, as well as provide the opportunity for the incorporation of recycled materials, and reclaimed energy sources to reduce dependence upon fossil fuels. Strategies will be included to maximize the life cycle performance of the building in an effort to increase the payback on initial investment; as well as provide a low maintenance facility capable of continual energy conservation improvements in the future.

Project Contact Person

Rodney Otterness City Administrator 600 Fourth Street International Falls, Minnesota 56649

Phone: (218) 283-9484

Email: rodneyo@ci.international-falls.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

International Falls: Voyageurs Heritage Center

| Evoluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 68% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funds. |
| | 12% of project costs are to be provided from federal funds. |
| | 31% is requested from state bond funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Using state funds to finance a building for a federal agency may be |
| | unprecedented. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | No. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the International Falls City Council adopted a resolution of |
| | support on June 25, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A predesign has not yet been submitted to the Department of |
| | Administration. |
| | |

Inver Grove Heights: Heritage Village Park

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,600,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Inver Grove Heights)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Inver Grove Heights, in Dakota County

Project At A Glance

The city of Inver Grove Heights is seeking \$4.6 million in funds for the development of Heritage Village Park on the Mississippi River; a park with regional, ecological and historical significance.

The public access to the Mississippi River provided by Heritage Village Park will be the culmination of a long-term partnership among the city of Inver Grove Heights, Dakota County, the Department of Natural Resources, National Park Service and National Park Foundation, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Minnesota Environmental Initiative, Friends of the Mississippi River, Braun Intertec, committed individuals and others.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Inver Grove Heights is seeking \$4.6 million in funds for the development of Heritage Village Park on the Mississippi River; a park with regional, ecological and historical significance. The 50 - 80 acre Heritage Village Park on the Mississippi River has begun and the park will provide a major public access to the Mississippi River; access to regional and national trails; space with ample parking to accommodate festivals and private celebrations; and interpretive opportunities highlighting the natural, cultural and transportation history of the site.

The Dakota County Mississippi River Regional Trail (MRRT) will run through the park. The property is well positioned to accommodate the MRRT, providing links to the river, recreational facilities (marinas and parks); existing local and regional bikeways and trails; and nearby transit lines. The MRRT will serve as the National Great River Road's Mississippi River Trail in Dakota County. The Great River Road extends from the Mississippi's headwaters in Itasca State Park to the Gulf of Mexico and is expected to draw local, regional, national and international visitors. Dakota County estimates that over 100,000 users could ride on the trail annually. The park location provides for easy access by road, trail, river or transit from major population centers.

The Mississippi River corridor provides significant wildlife habitat. It is used by 40 percent of the migratory waterfowl and over 60 percent of all migratory bird species in North America. A portion of the park lies within the Mississippi River flood plain. Though portions of it have been degraded by past railroad uses, the Heritage Village Park site offers a tremendous opportunity for habitat restoration. Restored native habitat is critical to the long-term health of the river ecosystem. This property was identified as a high priority site in the Northern Dakota Greenway Plan. It received the highest possible score from the DNR "regionally significant ecological areas", and is located within the identified Lower Mississippi Wildlife Corridor. Restoration of the park will add to the protected corridor of native habitat along the river and will be connected by the Mississippi River Regional Trail (MRRT) to the Scientific and Natural Area in southern Inver Grove Heights. The park design focuses on protecting and enhancing the natural resources represented by the river and the floodplain, while reconnecting the public to the Mississippi River.

Heritage Village Park is the site of the old "Village" settlement, and rail yard transportation hub. A multi-use Railroad Historic Center is proposed on the site of the former rail shop, providing space for historic displays, outdoor education and picnicking. The remains of the roundhouse foundation are nearby. The proximity of the historic double deck Swing Bridge and Old Village Hall add to the area's historical significance and providing abundant opportunities for interpretation and education.

Total Project Cost: \$11,200,000. The city of Inver Grove Heights is able to commit \$2,300,000 towards this project through this request.

The city of Inver Grove Heights has collaborated with a dozen different public and private agencies and organizations from the local, county, state and federal level in providing the impetus for the development of Heritage Village

Inver Grove Heights: Heritage Village Park

Park. These participants have supported the park project and are anticipated to continue their involvement. The city will continue to take a leadership role in the cleanup of the railroad brownfield. A program of voluntary acquisition of properties within the Mississippi River floodplain is also ongoing. The city will continue to fund our share of the project cost through park dedication and other city funding sources and will look for other funding partners as they come forward.

Funding that has been expended or secured is listed below:

| <u>Amount</u> | Source of Funds |
|---------------|--|
| \$93,298 | City of Inver Grove Heights - site investigation |
| \$150,000 | Minnesota Pollution Control Agency |
| \$26,665 | Minnesota Department of Commerce - site investigation |
| \$19,500 | City of Inver Grove Heights - Park Master Plan |
| \$180,000 | Department of Natural Resources Remediation Fund Grant - habitat restoration |
| \$300,000 | Dakota County Parks T-21 Federal Grant funding for 2007 |
| \$633,00 | Community Development Block Grant Funds |
| \$850,000 | Department of Natural Resources Flood Mitigation Funds |
| \$50,000 | National Park Foundation - Mississippi River Fund Dakota County Environmental Management Department - soil remediation |
| \$11,117 | Minnesota Environmental Initiative (MEI) - Response Action Plan and Natural Resource Restoration Plan |
| \$1,180 | Friends of the Mississippi River (FMR) - Natural Resource Restoration Plan |
| \$13,930 | City of Inver Grove Heights - Site Historical Inventory and Preliminary Grading Plan |
| \$750 | Braun Intertec - in-kind Response Action Plan |
| \$1,697,073 | · |

Previous Appropriations for this Project

See information included under Total Project Cost above

Other Considerations

The city of Inver Grove Heights will own and operate the park, and Dakota County Parks department will own and operate the Mississippi River Regional Trail. The Park is located within the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (MNRRA). Although the National Park Service will not be an owner operator in the park, they will be involved by providing expertise and assistance, raising awareness of the MNRRA and providing interpretive support.

Project Contact Person

Eric Carlson, Park and Recreation Director 8055 Barbara Avenue Inver Grove Heights, Minnesota 55077

Phone: (651) 450-2587; Fax: (651) 450-2490

Email: ecarlson@ci.inver-grove-heights.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Inver Grove Heights: Heritage Village Park

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| l '' | The city will provide 20% of the project's funding with city resources. |
| | (The state request covers an additional 40% of the project's cost.) |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| ۷. | Environmental cleanup and poviding recreational opportunities are |
| | important state missions in Minnesota. However, the degree to which |
| | these types of local projects should be funded by the state outside of |
| | existing state-funded grant programs, is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Inver Grove Heights City Council adopted a resolution of |
| | support on June 25, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| 10 | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign may not be required for this project. |

Iron Junction: Sewer Expansion Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$200,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Iron Junction)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Iron Junction, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Iron Junction is requesting \$200,000 in state funding to pay for a share of providing new sewer connections to an annexed area of the community that is comprised of 17 homes.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$200,000, which will write down the cost of new sewer service to an annexed area of the community that comprises 17 homes. The total cost of the project, \$909,437, is not affordable to this community of 88 people representing 48 households:

Local Significance:

The local significance of the Iron Junction Sewer Project is the resulting upgrade of the existing system to meet ongoing demand and to connect 17 households to the system. The 17 households have been annexed to the community and the Annexation Agreement identifies the need to connect these households to the existing wastewater treatment plant. It is estimated that all 17 individual sewer treatment systems (ISTS's) are failing or nonconforming systems. Connecting these households to the Iron Junction sewer system is locally significant and will alleviate serious health and safety concerns.

Regional Significance:

The project is regionally significant because the connection of 17 failing or non-conforming ISTS' will have a significant impact on the regions environment and quality of life.

State Significance:

The project will be significant to the State because the resulting elimination of health and safety concerns related to the existence of failing or non-conforming ISTS's meet State goals that assure the quality of life in Minnesota's and the State's commitment to healthy, sustainable communities.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$909,437. The city has identified nonstate sources for the remaining project costs: St. Louis County CDBG Funds (Pending) - \$200,000 USDA Rural Development (Pending) - \$409,437

Other Considerations

The city of Iron Junction will continue to own and operate the wastewater treatment facility.

If funding is awarded, no further dollars will be requested from the state.

Project Contact Person

Van Rioux, City Clerk City of Iron Junction PO Box 38 Iron Junction, Minnesota 55751 Phone: (218) 744-1412

Email: cityofiron@cpinternet.com

Governor's Recommendations

Iron Junction: Sewer Expansion Project

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| _ | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 67% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Iron Junction City Council adopted a resolution of support | |
| | on June 14, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| | toparation projects, or water and wastewater radiities. | |

Itasca County: Public Infrastructure to Support MSI

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$67,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Itasca County)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Nashwauk, in Itasca County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$67 million in state funding assistance for the public infrastructure needed to support the development of Minnesota Steel Industries' new taconite mine, pellet plant, direct reduction iron (DRI) plant, and steel mill in Nashwauk.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$67 million in state funding to acquire land, predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip the public infrastructure to support development of Minnesota Steel Industries' new taconite mine, pellet plant, direct reduction iron (DRI) plant, and steel mill to be located in the city of Nashwauk, Minnesota.

Public infrastructure to be developed includes roadways, railroad, gas pipeline, water, sewer, and an electrical substation and high voltage transmission lines — all to be owned and operated by local governmental units.

The project will require over 2,000 construction workers over a 36 month construction schedule, with 700 permanent employees and an annual payroll of over \$60 million. In addition, there will be 1,400 - 2,100 spin off jobs to support the facility.

This project will have a significant positive local, state and regional impact and will stabilize and expand the economy of Northeastern Minnesota.

Total Project Costs: The county estimates a total cost of \$150.8 million for the six categories of public infrastructure. The county is seeking \$67 million from the state in bond funds in 2008, which is in addition to \$23 million previously appropriated by the state. Remaining infrastructure costs will be covered by non-state funding sources.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This is a large, continuing program that received some funding from the 2006 Minnesota Legislature. That legislature appropriated \$12 million in the bonding bill and \$11 million in the omnibus supplemental appropriations bill for this project.

Other Considerations

- \$1.6 billion to be provided by Minnesota Steel in private funding for the plant and mill.
- ♦ \$63.7 million to be provided by city of Nashwauk in Public Utility Nonrecourse Revenue Bonds, for part of the needed electrical infrastructure.

Project Contact Person

Mr. David T. Christy Itasca County Engineer 23 NE 4th Street Grand Rapids, MN 55744 Phone: (218) 327-7387

Fax: (218) 327-0688

Email: dave.christy@co.itasca.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor recommends a total of \$30 million in state support for the roadway, railroad, gas pipeline, water, and sewer portions of this request, from three sources.

Itasca County: Public Infrastructure to Support MSI

First, the governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$6.2 million for this project, through a grant agreement with the state Department of Employment and Economic Development.

The governor also recommends that the Commissioner of Employment and Economic Development utilize \$14.9 million of the funds appropriated last session for the Minnesota minerals 21st century fund in a grant to Itasca county as another source of state support for this request. Finally the governor recommends that the Iron Range Resources board approve providing \$8.9 million of its funding resources for the project.

Itasca County: Public Infrastructure to Support MSI

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Of the total estimated \$150.8 million infrastructure project cost, 60% is being sought from the state. This leaves 40% of costs to be covered by non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Economic development is an important state mission. However, the degree to which these types of projects should receive funding assistance from the state is unclear and has varied considerably over time. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having local, regional and some degree of statewide significance. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? The state role in funding economic development projects has varied considerably from biennium to biennium. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? This request is in support of a unique project that does not directly compare to other submitted local funding requests. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, a resolution from the Itasca County Board, dated June 26, 2007, supporting the county request was provided. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A predesign was submitted to the Department of Administration in December 2005. | |

Jackson County: Prairie Ecology Regional Center

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Jackson County)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Lakefield, in Jackson County

Project At A Glance

Jackson County is requesting \$2.5 million in state funding to build a new regional nature/environmental education center that will house the Prairie Ecology Bus Center operations and provide for greatly expanded on-site programming targeted to the residents of southern Minnesota

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2.5 million in state funding to assist with the design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a new regional environmental science and nature education center with interpretive trails to serve southwest Minnesota to be located in Jackson County in the city of Lakefield which will provide science-based training on environmental topics to youth educators, natural resource professionals, business professionals, and the general public of the region.

The Prairie Ecology Bus Center is a non-profit environmental learning center serving 25 counties in southern and western Minnesota since 1994. The PEBC provides educational programming about our region's natural resources to pre-school audiences through adult learners. Utilizing the Ecology Bus, a mobile laboratory and classroom, the PEBC brings the capability of providing outdoor educational programs to people where they live – essentially in their own backyards. In addition to the Ecology Bus programs, the PEBC provides large-group, assembly programs, community education classes, educator training workshops, adult seminars, public

education programs and more. The PEBC reaches over 10,000 youth and adults with its programming each year.

The PEBC operates from a small house owned by Jackson County Parks and located in Sparks County Park, Jackson County. In PEBC's 13 years of growth, it has outgrown its space and the building is deteriorating. While the building space can be repaired, it still will not be able to accommodate the organizational operations and expanded programming delivered from this site. The proposed project entails building a new regional nature/environmental education center that will house the PEBC operations and provide for greatly expanded on-site programming targeted to the residents of southern Minnesota.

The facility will highlight our agricultural roots by remodeling an existing barn on the property into the primary classroom space on the main floor and a lecture/seminar hall on the second floor. (Note: this facility will not at all look like the former Prairie Expo building!) A new addition to the building will replicate the look of the existing barn and will extend out from the west side of the barn. It will include an exhibit hall with interactive displays and activities, auxiliary classroom space in the great room with additional education space on the exterior deck, PEBC offices, workroom space for staff, interns and volunteers, a conference room for modest-size meetings, storage allocations for program equipment and supplies and a small gift shop and reception desk area. We will be seeking a LEED designation for this facility.

Not only will the new building house the PEBC, but program capabilities will be greatly enhanced and expanded to allow space and facilities for on-site regional educator training workshops, provide a means of hosting adult seminars and retreats on topics including natural resources, renewable energies, ag-related subjects, land stewardship, intergenerational programming, etc. and also allowing for adequate facilities to host fundraising events to support the educational programs offered and the center. Such a facility can also be rented out as meeting and reception space, providing another source of revenue to support the facility. The new facility will also allow for youth and adult volunteer involvement in educational programming, building, grounds and exhibit maintenance. Currently, the PEBC office cannot provide for these types of activities and such programs have to be

Jackson County: Prairie Ecology Regional Center

located elsewhere. No other environmental learning centers exist in this capacity in southwestern Minnesota.

The new 11,000 square foot facility will be designed to provide a working example of the organization's environmental philosophy and will be an accessible role model for other organizations, individuals and businesses seeking to incorporate sustainable building principles into their own construction projects. The building will be designed to use very little energy, maximize the use of natural day-lighting and ventilation, apply creative use of recycled materials and sustainably grown products, incorporate geothermal heating/cooling systems, provide a composting toilet for an exterior public restroom, harvest rainwater in catchment systems for landscaping irrigation, implement the use of raingardens and other strategies, and we are exploring wind and solar energy systems to power the center. It is planned to have seminars during the construction phase to show people the process of installing some of the green features mentioned previously.

The proposed facility is the first phase of a broader project involving the development of the Sparks County Park to include interpretive trails throughout the park and education support features to enhance programs. Such park development will serve to educate people about the types of flora and fauna, and their ecologies, that are often seen throughout our southwestern region of Minnesota. People can come to the park, not only to learn about the natural world, but also to cultivate an understanding of the resources that sustain us, develop an appreciation for those resources and create a sense of stewardship in that people are part of the natural system and need to be informed caretakers of our land, water and air. Such an educational facility and subsequent improvement to the public land within the park will serve to make the PEBC facility and the Sparks County Park a destination site for the region. No other such public facility exists in the region whose complete focus is on educating the public about the environment and natural resources of our southern region. The development of the new program and training center will also provide a tremendous means of facilitating awareness of the educational programs available to residents throughout our 25-county region, thereby supporting the outreach programs that are also provided via the Ecology Bus.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is not specified. Non-state funding of \$1.43 million from a variety of sources is being sought.

Project Contact Person

Chrystal Dunker, PEBC Director PO Box 429 Lakefield, Minnesota 56150

Phone: 507-662-5064

Email: ecologybus@ecologybus.org

www.ecologybus.org

Governor's Recommendations

Jackson County: Prairie Ecology Regional Center

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Total project costs have not been identified. The request is for \$2.5 million in state funding. Non-state funding of \$1.43 million is being sought. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing opportuntiies to learn about the environment is an important state mission. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? The project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Jackson County Board adopted a resolution of support on April 24, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A predesign has not yet been submitted. | |

Kasson: 16th Street Bridge & Road Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,963,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Kasson)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Kasson, in Dodge County

Project At A Glance

This request for \$4,963,445 in state funding for the 16th Street Bridge and Road Improvement project will allow the city of Kasson to design and construct a 10-ton, all weather road from Highway 57 in the city of Kasson to the County Line Road that forms the boundary between Dodge and Olmsted Counties. The request will also fund the replacement of a one-lane bridge over Masten Creek with a modern structure appropriate for this type of roadway.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

At this time, because only two improved roadways go east from Kasson, all traffic from the north and/or west of Kasson is forced to travel the entire north-south length of Kasson to enter either Highway 14 or County Road 34 and travel to Rochester. This puts enormous pressure on a single city street (Highway 57/Mantorville Avenue). In fact, recent Kasson traffic counts show more trips per day on Mantorville Avenue than on US Highway 14.

Creating this alternative route on the north edge of Kasson would relieve the pressure on a city street to handle the growing commuter traffic that moves between Dodge County and Rochester.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

No previous state funding has been received for this project.

Other Considerations

The city of Kasson would own and maintain the street and bridge that lies within the corporate limits of Kasson. Dodge County would own the mileage outside the city Limits.

Project Contact Person

Michael Martin Planner City of Kasson 401 5th Street Southeast Kasson, Minnesota 55944 Phone: (507) 634-6328 Fax: (507) 634-4737

Email: planning_eda@cityofkasson.com

Governor's Recommendations

Kasson: 16th Street Bridge & Road Improvements

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation is an important state mission. The state has existing |
| | grant programs to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Transportation is an important state mission. The state has existing |
| | grant programs to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Kasson City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 13, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |
| | 1 |

Koochiching County: Renewable Energy Clean Air Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$7,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Koochiching County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Koochiching County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$7.5 million in state funding to supplement the \$2.5 million state funding appropriated in 2006 to design, construct and equip a new Plasma Torch Gasification facility to be located in International Falls, in Koochiching County, for the purpose of converting municipal solid wastes (MSW) that would otherwise go to landfills into energy in the form of syn-gas, biofuels, steam or electricity and a non-leachable slag to be use for road aggregate, tile or rock wool.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This waste-to-energy conversion process is without any adverse environmental consequences.

Even though Minnesota is one of the leading states in recycling its MSW, the state is still dumping over 2 million tons a year of MSW into landfills throughout Minnesota, lowa, and Wisconsin. The rate of recycling appears to have reached a plateau in the range of 45 to 50 percent of Minnesota's total MSW. The percentage of the total MSW going into landfills has increased from 18 percent ten years ago to 36 percent today. This cannot be sustained. Minnesota landfills will reach capacity in about 15 years and any new ones will be opposed due to increasing stress on the existing landfill infrastructure throughout the state.

A solution is needed to eliminate MSW from going into landfills while using the MSW as an energy source without harming the environment. The solution is Plasma Torch technology.

Plasma Torch technology will convert the MSW that is not recycled into a renewable energy resource. This process has regional and statewide significance in that the process is scalable and can be reproduced in various areas of the state. The solution will help fulfill the state mission to increase by 2011 the amount of MSW to be used for waste-to-energy conversion from presently 20 percent to 35 percent of the total MSW generated in the state. Regions within the state can pool their MSW together to provide the feedstock quantity needed for each Plasma Torch facility.

A Plasma Torch Gasification facility subjects MSW within a reaction chamber using one or more torches to a heat source that is hotter than the surface of the sun. At these high temperatures the organic materials in the MSW gasify into basic gases such as hydrogen and carbon monoxide, and the inorganic materials in the MSW are vitrified into a molten slag or igneous rock. The gas can be used as an alternative to natural gas, or to produce biofuels, steam or electricity and the molten slag can produce products such as road aggregate, tile, road pavers or rock wool.

The key to the technology is the Plasma Torch. The torch produces controlled lightning. Lightning is a form of plasma found in nature that is very hot. When MSW is exposed to temperatures above 7,000 C° it quickly gasifies or produces a vitrified material. This process all occurs within an oxygen starved environment inside the gasification reactor chamber. It is important to note that there is no burning involved in the Plasma gasification process. This simple fact provides an emission advantage over traditional thermal pyrolytic processes. In the plasma gasification process there are no furans and dioxins produced. Furans and dioxins are pollutants that are produced in low temperature thermal waste to energy processes like incineration. As a result of the elevated temperatures of the plasma process fewer pollutants are formed.

The result is the environment is protected, nothing goes into the landfill, and energy is extracted from the MSW as a renewable fuel.

Koochiching County: Renewable Energy Clean Air Project

Plasma Torch facilities using MSW as a fuel source are operating in Japan. The facilities are modular and scalable from 100 to 1,000 tons of MSW per day. The project will not expand the state's role in a new policy area but rather enhances Minnesota active role in waste-to-energy systems. Minnesota has 12 active waste-to-energy facilities using incineration technology. This project will not compete with this existing waste-to-energy infrastructure. Instead it will expand the state's waste-to-energy capacity.

The RECAP project in Koochiching County using the county's waste and waste from surrounding counties will process approximately 100 tons of MSW per day. The facility will be designed to run 24 hours per day and 7 days a week with scheduled maintenance for the plasma torch every 1,500 to 2,000 hours of operation. The facility will generate about 40 MMBtu/hr of syngas, or approximately 40,000 lbs/hr of steam for industrial use or alternatively the steam can be used to drive a steam turbine to produce an approximate net 3MW of electrical capacity. Biofuels can be produced from the syn-gas.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$30 million. Of this total, the county will provide \$10 million, the U.S. Departments of Energy and Agriculture will provide a total of \$5 million, private investment will provide \$5 million, and the state legislature appropriated \$2.5 million in the 2006 bonding bill.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. The project generates cash flow on its own through three revenue streams: (a) tipping fees from the MSW; (b) sale of syn-gas, biofuels, steam or electricity; and (c) sale of road aggregate, tile or rock wool.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In the 2006 bonding bill this project received \$2.5 million (out of a \$10 million bond request).

Other Considerations

Based on preliminary evaluation we anticipate that the total cost for the Plasma Gasification Waste-to-Energy facility will cost \$30 million. The project presently has secured \$400,000 that will be directed towards a feasibility

study evaluating technology, emissions, economics, and operation and maintenance issues. Once the feasibility study is concluded the project will begin the predesign segment of the total program. At this point submission of a predesign document can be delivered to the Commissioner of Administration.

Project Contact Person

Teresa Jaksa, Koochiching County Coordinator 715 Fourth Street International Falls, Minnesota 56649

Phone: (218) 283-1152 Fax: (218) 283-1151

Email: teresa.jaksa@co.koochiching.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Koochiching County: Renewable Energy Clean Air Project

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 67% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing environmentally clean waste management processes is an important state mission. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Koochiching County Board adopted a resolution of support on June 26, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Not yet; predesign funding is requested as part of the request for state funds. | |

La Crescent: Wagon Wheel Rec & Commuter Trail

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$249,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (La Crescent)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of La Cescent, in Houston County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$249,100 in state funding to design and build the Wagon Wheel recreational and commuter trail in the city of La Crescent.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This trail would serve three purposes:

- ♦ Provide a safe commuting trail between La Crescent and La Crosse, Wisconsin, which are part of the same metropolitan area.
- Provide access to the Upper Mississippi River Fish and Wildlife Refuge within the city limits, offering outdoor recreation and educational opportunities to adults, children and people with disabilities.
- This trail will be a vital link between the Root River Trail system in Minnesota and Wisconsin's trail system, joining together at La Crescent-La Crosse.

The existing length of the Root River Trail is nationally known. The new section parallels Minnesota Highway 16, a National Scenic Byway. Once connected to the trail system at La Crosse, Wisconsin and La Crescent, Minnesota, the two states' trail systems will be even more attractive to visitors because of their variety of scenery and amenities, length and scenic beauty. This trail can also connect to the planned national Mississippi River Trail running alongside the Great River Road. The trail has local and regional significance because it will allow people to ride to work off busy Highway 14-16-61, and provide recreational opportunities on the federal refuge.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$730,000. The city has indicated that \$481,000 in non-state funds are available to be contributed to the project.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. The city will maintain the trail.

Project Contact Person

Tom van der Linden Chairman, Houston County Trails 30585 County Road 1 La Crescent, Minnesota 55947

Phone: (507) 643-6209

Email: koksetna@acegroup.cc

Governor's Recommendations

La Crescent: Wagon Wheel Rec & Commuter Trail

| Evaluation of Local Projects |
|---|
| |
| To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| 66% of project costs will be provided from non-state funding sources. |
| Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| Providing recreational opportunities via trails is an important state |
| mission in Minnesota. The state has existing grant programs to |
| provide financial assistance in this area. |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| This project is viewed as having a primarily local or regional benefit. |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| No. |
| Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| See #2 above. |
| Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| projects. |
| Does project compete with other facilities? |
| Not significantly. |
| Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| Yes, the Houston County Board adopted a resolution of support on |
| January 9, 2007 |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| requesting? |
| N/A |
| Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| been submitted? |
| A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of raods, |
| brdiges, trails or pathways. |
| |

Lindstrom: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$830,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Lindstrom)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Lindstrom, in Chisago County

Project At A Glance

The city of Lindstrom requests state funding for two capital projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$780,000 in state funding to design and construct a replacement bridge for State Highway 8 over the water channel between South and North Lindstrom Lakes in Lindstrom.
- \$50,000 in state funding to dredge the channel under a new bridge for State Highway 8 between South and North Lindstrom Lakes in Lindstrom.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: State Highway 8 Bridge Replacement

\$780,000 in state funding is requested to design and construct a replacement bridge for State Highway 8 over the water channel between South and North Lindstrom Lakes in Lindstrom. The bridge will be an attractive amenity to the city with vehicular travel lanes as well as a bicycle and pedestrian path on each side, a bike/pedestrian underpass with stairs and accessible ramps, an observation platform overlooking the lake, a fishing platform at the waters edge, street lights to match the ones downtown, and construction materials that reflect the character of Lindstrom's downtown.

Concept development for major road improvements by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) on state Trunk Highway (TH) 8 began in July 2005 for the 2.5-mile Lindstrom segment. The \$5.76 million in

federal funding is inadequate to cover the costs of a complete, multi-modal roadway and bridge. This bridge project is one component of the larger Lindstrom TH 8 project. It is urgent that additional funding be secured for the bridge project so that the overall TH 8 project stays on schedule. Economies of scale can be realized by designing and constructing the bridge replacement with the rest of the highway.

High volumes of traffic travel through Lindstrom's lively downtown "main street", which is TH 8. The existing bridge over the Lindstrom lake channel is on the edge of the downtown, and serves as the gateway to the city. MnDOT has determined that the bridge must be replaced, and has proposed a concrete box culvert due to funding limitations. The city of Lindstrom has worked hard to develop an active downtown, with restaurants, businesses and community life; Lindstrom strives to retain the "Main Street" character of TH 8 as it passes through town, and the city's small town appeal. The city wants to ensure that improvements to TH 8 not only relieve the traffic congestion and increase travel times of through-traffic (MnDOT's primary goal), but that this project does not end up having a negative impact on the economic vitality and appealing character of the city. The bridge as proposed should instead have a positive impact on the city's economy, character and quality of life.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$1.564 million. In addition to the \$780,000 state funding requested, the city will allocate the \$57,600 of Federal Highway Administration funding over which it has discretion to this project. The city is committed to funding the gap in the project cost, with city funds, private contributions and/or grants.

The replacement bridge will help meet the following state missions:

- Safer highways with fewer accidents: The underpass and the trails should reduce the number of people trying to dash across the highway, reducing the chance of accidents. One child has been killed crossing TH 8 in Lindstrom already.
- Reduce road congestion: The project should remove most of the bicyclists and pedestrians from the highway shoulders, reducing the congestion for vehicles.

Lindstrom: Two Projects

- Provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility: The facility, including the observation platform and fishing platform, will be accessible for people with disabilities.
- Provide for bicycling and walking as alternative transportation modes:
 The trails will encourage the reduction of gas use and car exhaust, and encourage healthy lifestyles.
- Provide a climate for economic stability and improvement: The project will be an attractive gateway to the city and amenity for tourist and residents. The Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) lists quality of life as a top 10 attractor for new businesses.
- Provide recreational opportunities: The project will provide for walking, biking, wildlife watching, and boating, which are some of the most popular recreational activities in Minnesota.
- Spend funds efficiently: By combining the bridge project with the larger highway project, economies of scale are achieved, reducing design and construction costs.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

MnDOT already owns and maintains a bridge at this location. Operation and maintenance of a replacement bridge will not add significant new costs for the state.

Other Considerations

\$5.76 million in Federal Highway Administration funding is appropriated for a 2.5 mile TH 8 improvement project through Lindstrom. The bridge replacement is a portion of that larger project. The portion of the funding to be allocated to the bridge is yet to be determined by the MnDOT. One percent of the \$5.76 million is allocated for enhancements at the city's discretion. As explained above, the city will allocate this \$57,600 toward the bridge. The city is committed to funding the gap in the project cost, with city funds, private contributions and/or grants.

Project Contact Person

John Olinger, City Administrator Lindstrom City Hall 13292 Sylvan Avenue Lindstrom, Minnesota 55045 Phone: (651) 257-0625

Priority 2: Reconnecting Lindstrom Lakes-Dredging

Boating is a vital part of Lindstrom's history, present community life and economic livelihood. It is important to reopen the channel to restore the historical condition of "Kichi Saga" the "Big Lake." The major reconstruction work by MnDOT on state TH 8 in Chisago County provides a great opportunity to restore the historic navigation channel between North and South Lindstrom Lakes. Originally, steamships plied their way through these lakes delivering goods between diverse communities. When the railroad and highways were built the once large bays and deep connections were filled to accommodate bridges. Over the years silting has continued and now what once was one large lake is a series of loosely connected lake and the connection between the lakes was lost.

The city proposes to dredge a 25'x270' channel between North and South Lindstrom Lakes to

- Serve as an attractive, functional gateway to the city
- ♦ Is an economic benefit to the businesses in the downtown
- Reconnect the lakes and provide access for canoes, pontoons and fisherman to access several lakes in the Chain of Lakes

The city of Lindstrom has worked hard to retain the "Small Town Main Street" character of TH 8 as it passes through town. TH 8 crosses over the North South Lindstrom Lake connection at the west end of the small downtown. The city has done a lot to retain its small town appeal for residents and tourists. To add to its appeal, the city and community groups have installed its landmark coffeepot shaped water tower, historic statues, a veteran's memorial, decorative signs and lamp posts, and a visitor center, all along TH 8. With is amenities, it is arguably one of the most appealing small city

Lindstrom: Two Projects

downtowns in Minnesota. The city wants to ensure that improvements to our area enhance our ability to attract tourists and provide services to our local residents. If connected the waterway will be a positive addition to the city that would increase its economic vitality by increasing its appeal for tourists and increasing opportunities and livability for residents.

This channel and the bridge over it also tell an important tale of Minnesota history. Many of the early Swedish and other early immigrants traveled to Taylors Falls by boat, then traveled overland through this area to start farms on the prairies. The first major bridge was a 1880s-era high railroad bridge crossing the then-wide channel. Steamships worked these waters delivering people and goods to various spots along this large peninsula.

With its many lakes, Lindstrom and Chisago County have been a tourist destination since the late 1800s. North and South Lindstrom Lake, which connect via this narrow, un-navigable but natural channel, are an important part of the city's character and appeal. Restaurants, boating operations, tourist accommodations and residential homes line the lakes, and have for 100 years. TH 8 now crosses this channel with a bridge. The main street/ TH 8 is lively, with restaurants and shops lining both sides.

The city has made the difficult decision to change the configuration of TH 8 through the downtown to one-way pairs on the current TH 8 and parallel 1st Street, even though it will mean losing some viable, long-time businesses, and will be a major impact to adjacent businesses and residents. This is a concession to improve the traffic flow through the downtown. The city is concerned about the effects of this change for local businesses and residents. Connection the lakes will help to offset any negative aspects of the road reconfiguration in downtown.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$100,000. The city is committed to funding the non-state share of the project cost, through city funds, private donations, and/or grants.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. However, it will be in the jurisdiction of the city of Lindstrom and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

Project Contact Person (for both projects)

John Olinger, City Administrator City of Lindstrom 13292 Sylvan Avenue Lindstrom, Minnesota 55045 Phone: (651) 257-0620

Governor's Recommendations

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

Lindstrom: Two Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1, State Highway 8 Bridge Replacement: 50% of project costs | |
| | for the additional enhancements to the bridge design are to be | |
| | provided from local government funds. | |
| | Priority 2, Reconnecting Lindstrom Lakes-Dredging: 50% of project | |
| | costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priority 1, State Highway 8 Bridge Replacement: Transportation is an | |
| | important state mission. The state has existing cost participation | |
| | policies for enhancements to highway and bridge designs. | |
| | | |
| | Priority 2, Reconnecting Lindstrom Lakes-Dredging: Providing | |
| | enhanced tourism or economic development potential is an important | |
| | state mission in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these | |
| | types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | Priority 1, State Highway 8 Bridge Replacement: The TH8 | |
| | improvement project is a state priority; enhancements to the | |
| | proposed Mn/DOT bridge design are viewed as having primarily a | |
| | local benefit. | |
| | Drievity 2. Decomposition Lindstrops Lakes Dradwings This preject is | |
| | Priority 2, Reconnecting Lindstrom Lakes-Dredging: This project is | |
| _ | viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| _ | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| 6. | See #2 above. Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| 0. | Priority 1, State Highway 8 Bridge Replacement: Mn/DOT has a cost | |
| | participation policy to address enhancements to state highway | |
| | projects. | |
| | Priority 2, Reconnecting Lindstrom Lakes-Dredging: If funded, other | |
| | local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| ١٠. | Priority 1: State Highway 8 Bridge Replacement. Not significantly. | |
| | Thomas T. State Highway o Bridge Replacement. Not significantly. | |
| | Priority 2: Reconnecting Lindstrom Lakes-Dredging. Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| ٥. | Yes; the Lindstrom City Council adopted a resolution of support for | |
| | the projects on June 21, 2007. | |
| | the projects on dutie 21, 2007. | |

| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. |
|-----|---|
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Predesigns are not required for these types of projects. |

Litchfield: Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$7,150,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Litchfield)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Litchfield, in Meeker County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$7,150,000 in state funding to predesign, design, construct and equip necessary improvements to the Litchfield Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) for the treatment and disposal of wastewater from the collection system in Litchfield, Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Litchfield is the county seat of Meeker County. The community of approximately 6,600 is home to several industries including First District Association, an independent dairy cooperative which processes milk from the regions dairy farmers located in 35 Minnesota Counties, including; Anoka, Benton, Brown, Carlton, Carver, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Crow Wing, Douglas, Freeborn, Grant, Isanti, Kanabec, Kandiyohi, Lac Qui Parle, Lincoln, Lyon, Mcleod, Meeker, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Nicollet, Otter Tail, Pine, Pope, Redwood, Renville, Sherburne, Sibley, Stearns, Swift, Todd, Wadena, Watonwan, Wright and Yellow Medicine.

First District Association sells cheese, milk and whey products to food manufacturers and directly to a retail market. Dairy product manufacturing at the Litchfield creamery creates potent wastewater that is discharged to the WWTF. There it is treated to standards set forth by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) in place to protect the waters of the state.

The MPCA conducted a scheduled five year National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit review and renewal for the WWTF. This process yielded more stringent effluent requirements due to conditions of the

receiving stream, Jewitts Creek, which flows to the North Fork of the Crow River the Crow River and into the Mississippi River. At a similar time to the MPCA review of the discharge permit, the city of Litchfield approached First District Association regarding future plans of the dairy. First District Association expressed a desire to investigate an expansion with significant impacts in flows and loads to the WWTF. The city contracted with Bolton and Menk Engineering to conduct a facility assessment and draft a facility plan to meet the needs of the expanding creamery and meet the more stringent effluent limits.

Bolton and Menk considered several treatment options. Recommendations are outlined in the 2008 Litchfield Wastewater Treatment Facility Plan and include the following; trickling filter modifications, new intermediate clarifiers, new tertiary filters, new disinfection, new biogas storage facilities and new biosolids storage.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

No state dollars will be required to operate this facility.

Other Considerations

Materials of construction will minimize maintenance and be energy efficient. The construction of biogas storage will reduce the existing natural gas use by the facility. The biosolids treatment process of anaerobic digestion currently uses primarily natural gas and wastes the biogas to the atmosphere. A majority of the biogas can be consumed onsite and reduce outside energy usage with the addition of biogas storage.

Project Contact Person

Mr. Bradley C. DeWolf, P.E. City Engineer/Project Manager 7533 Sunwood Dr. Ste. 206 Ramsey, Minnesota 55303

Phone: (612) 756-1032

Email: bradde@bolton-menk.com

Governor's Recommendations

Litchfield: Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | | |
| | assistance in this area. | | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | | |
| | No | | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | | |
| | No | | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | | |
| | Not significantly. | | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | | |
| | Yes; the Litchfield City Council adopted a resoultion of support for the | | |
| | project on June 18, 2007. | | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | | |
| | requesting? | | |
| | N/A | | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | | |
| | been submitted? | | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer | | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | | |

Mankato: Civic Center/Arena Expansion

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,200,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Mankato)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Mankato, in Blue Earth County

Project At A Glance

\$1.2 million in state assistance to predesign and design the expansion and renovation of the Mankato Civic Center/Arena and the development of Southern Minnesota Women's Hockey Exposition Center for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The \$1.2 million 2008 capital request from the state of Minnesota will be utilized for the predesign and design phases of a multi-phase project to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip an addition to the Civic Center of a Women's Hockey Exposition Center to be utilized by Minnesota State University, Mankato Division I Hockey Program, as a practice facility for the University's Men's Program and as intermittent exposition space by the City's Civic Center. In addition, the city will renovate the Civic Center and Arena space so as to be competitive with the State funded upgrades of other civic center, convention, and campus hockey arenas in Minnesota.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the 2008 phase of the project, which is to predesign and design the Southern Minnesota Women's Hockey Exposition Center and Theatre/Auditorium project, is \$2.4 million. Of this total, the city will provide \$1.2 million (50 percent of the cost).

The city anticipates requesting \$10 million in state funding in 2010, in order to provide 100% of the funding for Phase II of the project, which is to construct, furnish and equip the addition.

The city also expects to request \$5 million in state funding in 2012, in order to provide half of the funding for Phase III of the project, which is to construct, furnish and equip the Theatre/Auditorium.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

None. The city of Mankato constructed the Civic Center and Arena with local funding resources, and unlike other civic centers and arenas in Minnesota did not receive funding support from the MnSCU capital budget or the State of Minnesota. Additionally, MnSCU discontinued support of leasehold costs for Division I hockey facilities not owned and operated by the various university campuses.

Other Considerations

The statewide significance of the project is as follows:

- The existing Mankato Civic Center and Arena serves a market area in Southern Minnesota and Northern Iowa of over 500,000 people for conventions, major events, concerts, and sporting events with a \$20 million annual economic impact. Unlike most of the convention centers and events centers in Minnesota, Mankato's building was totally funded with local resources.
- The 5,000 seat arena serves as home ice for Minnesota State University, Mankato Mavericks Hockey Team. The arena was constructed and operated without support of the state of Minnesota. All other WCHA teams and Bemidji State receive capital support for their arenas and institutional financial support in the operations thereof.
- The Minnesota State Mavericks Division I Women's Team plays their games and practices in a significantly substandard facility that is owned and operated by the community. The Men's program plays their games in the Civic Center raising concerns and questions regarding gender equity.
- Because Minnesota State University, Mankato leases the practice facility and the Civic Center Arena from the city, they do not receive operational support from the state of Minnesota or MnSCU. St. Cloud State, Bemidji

Mankato: Civic Center/Arena Expansion

State, University of Minnesota and University of Minnesota Duluth all receive operational support directly from MnSCU or institutional support from the university system. Accordingly, Minnesota State University, Mankato operates their hockey program at a significant financial disadvantage as compared to the other WCHA programs and Bemidji State.

Project Contact Person

Patrick W. Hentges, City Manager City of Mankato 10 Civic Center Plaza PO Box 3368 Mankato, Minnesota, 56002-3368

Phone: (507) 387-8695 Fax: (507) 388-7530

Email: phentges@city.mankato.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Mankato: Civic Center/Arena Expansion

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of 2008 project costs are to be provided from local government | |
| | funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state role in funding civic center and community center style | |
| | projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to | |
| | another. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if | |
| | the state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Mankato City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | July 9, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Predesign funding is requested as part of the request for state funds. | |
| | | |

Marshall: M.E.R.I.T. Center Expansion

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$12,501,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Marshall)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Marshall, in Lyon County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$12.501 million in state funding to acquire additional land, predesign, design, construct, furnish, and equip an expansion of the Minnesota Emergency Response and Industrial Training (MERIT) regional training facility serving Southwest and West Central Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The M.E.R.I.T. Center regional training facility is located in Marshall, Minnesota and serves the nineteen counties in Southwest and West Central Minnesota. The 2008 request for \$12.501 million in state funding would be to acquire additional land, predesign, design, and construct a driving range and an office/classroom facility. This would provide modern and comprehensive driving and driving simulator experience for all emergency responders, first responders, industrial/commercial driver's and new or novice drivers.

Federal funding is also being requested for the Center to compliment the state funding for this same time period to fund agricultural emergency response training primarily to train first responders and emergency response personnel on safe and effective response tactics to ethanol plant emergency events and ethanol transportation emergency events as well as for confined space rescue in agricultural settings.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the 2008 project to expand the M.E.R.I.T. Center is \$17.241 million. The city is seeking \$3.74 million for the project from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$880,000 in 1999 and \$440,000 in 2000.

Other Considerations

The city of Marshall anticipates making requests for additional state funding for the M.E.R.I.T. Center in 2010 and 2012. A second funding request of \$7,924,500 in 2010 is to facilitate a driving and firing simulator for first responders and law enforcement personnel and to fully develop the EVOC training center. In addition the request of \$5,239,250 in 2012 is to predesign, design, construct, and equip the outdoor law enforcement administrative/classroom and maintenance building for the driving range. Additional Federal funding for those future phases will be sought in 2010 and 2012.

Project Contact Person

Robert A. Yant, Director of Public Safety 611 West Main Street Marshall, Minnesota 56258 Phone: (507) 537-6032

Fax: (507) 537-6034

Governor's Recommendations

Marshall: M.E.R.I.T. Center Expansion

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | | |
| | 27.5% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding | | |
| | sources. | | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | | |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission | | |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local | | |
| _ | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | | |
| 4 | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | | |
| ٥. | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission | | |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local | | |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | | |
| _ | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | | |
| | projects. | | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | | |
| | The degree to which the project competes with other facilities | | |
| | depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic | | |
| | service area. | | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | | |
| | The Marshall City Council adopted a resolution of support on July 16, | | |
| _ | 2007. | | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | | |
| | requesting? N/A | | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | | |
| 10. | been submitted? | | |
| | Not yet submitted. | | |
| | Not yet Submitted. | | |

Medford: Wastewater Treatment & Water System

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$7,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Medford)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Medford, in Steele County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$7.5 million in state funding for a major required upgrade to the Wastewater Treatment Facility and to construct required Water System Improvements.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Medford is requesting \$7.5 million in state funding for their required (MPCA/MDH) Wastewater and Water System Improvements. This project is to acquire land, predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a major upgrade to the Wastewater Treatment Facility as per the agreement with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, and to construct Water System Improvements as per the agreement with the Minnesota Department of Health to address water quality issues.

As per an agreement with the MPCA, the city is required to complete additional improvements to the Wastewater Treatment Facility. The city is presently constructing interim improvements. The interim improvements of \$1,525,000 are being financed through the PFA as a loan.

The city of Medford is also required to complete \$3.5 million in water system improvements as per an agreement with the MDH. These improvements are to address a water quality issue. These improvements are to be completed and operable by the end of 2009.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the wastewater and water system improvements is \$10 million. The city has secured financing through a PFA loan for \$1,525,000, and is providing an additional \$1 million for a portion of the water system improvements.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The city of Medford is now constructing interim Wastewater Treatment Facility improvements (\$1,525,000) that are being financed in 2007 through a PFA loan.

Other Considerations

The facilities will be located in the city of Medford and/or the city of Owatonna (water project) all in Steele County, Minnesota. This project has local, regional and statewide significance due to employment, housing, industrial and retail implications for present and future growth considerations. This project affects the two major retail centers along the I-35 corridor.

Project Contact Person

Fax:

Bruce R. Bullert, P.E. Community Partners Designs, Inc. 1900 Cardinal Lane Faribault, Minnesota 55021 Phone: (507) 334-4120

(507) 334-3453 Email: brbcpi@hickorytech.net

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Medford: Wastewater Treatment & Water System

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 25% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| - | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| 0. | A draft of a resolution considered by the Medford City Council on | |
| | June 25, 2007 was provided. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| 0. | requesting? | |
| | Yes | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| 10. | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer | |
| | | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$97,240,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of Minneapolis)

PROJECT LOCATION: various locations in Minneapolis, in Hennepin cnty

Project At A Glance

The city of Minneapolis requests state funding for seven capital projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$62 million to pay the principal amount of outstanding bonds the city had issued for the Target Center facility.
- ♦ \$2 million for the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway Lighting Renovation.
- ♦ \$600,000 to acquire land, pre-design, design and construct a bridge for the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway in St. Anthony Parkway over the Northtown Rail Yard. Note: The Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board has also submitted a bonding request for one project within the Grand Rounds system.
- ♦ \$6.85 million for the first phase of the SEMI University Research Park project.
- \$13.59 million to design construct, furnish and quip a new Joint Emergency Operations Center for Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis.
- ♦ \$6.5 million for several projects necessary to construct new infrastructure and remove barriers to transit supportive redevelopment at two station areas of the Hiawatha Light Rail Transit (LRT) Corridor in Minneapolis.
- ♦ \$2.7 million for the first phase of a Forensic Laboratory for the Minneapolis Police Department.

The city is also requesting state funding for one unprioritized capital project:

\$3 million to plan and pre-design the redevelopment of Orchestra Hall.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Target Center Debt Reduction

This request is for \$62 million to relieve the city of debt service costs associated with the outstanding city-backed bonds for the Target Center. The Target Center is a public entertainment venue of regional and state significance. In addition to professional sports and performances by national and international entertainers, the Target Center plays host to state high school league sanctioned games and tournaments. The Target Center also hosts some University of Minnesota athletic events (wrestling). The facility was built with private funds but in 1995 the legislature authorized the city of Minneapolis to purchase the facility and finance the purchase with city-backed bonds. The bonds are paid by a variety of local sources including the entertainment tax, parking revenues, tax increment, and other development funds.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this request is \$62 million. However, the city will continue to own, operate and oversee improvements to the facility. The annual operating subsidy could be up to \$2.0 million, while the capital maintenance budget is at least \$500,000. Over the years the city has also made additional expenditures to upgrade the facility. For example, approximately \$14.0 million in capital improvements have been paid by the city since 2003.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

None. (It is not a phase of this project, but since 1995 the city through the Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission has received an annual appropriation of \$750,000 for the Target Center. The appropriation is meant to be used for amateur sports events.)

Other Considerations

Until 2006, the city paid the debt service. In the last two years the city has also contributed to an operating deficit.

The assumption of debt service by the state will permit the city to continue to upgrade the facility so that it can be an attractive venue for regional, state and national events. The city could contribute annually up to \$2 million to operate the Target Center as well as another \$500,000 to \$1 million in capital improvements.

Project Contact Person: Target Center Debt Reduction

Patrick Born Finance Director City of Minneapolis Room 325M City Hall Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Phone: (612) 673-3375 Fax: (612) 673-2042

Email: patrick.born@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Priority 2: Grand Rounds Scenic Byway Lighting Renovation

The request is for \$2 million for each of the next three bonding years to replace deteriorated poles, fixtures, and electrical wiring associated with the lighting systems in place along Grand Rounds Scenic Byway located throughout the city. The project will replace approximately 2,300 poles and fixtures that were installed approximately 30 years ago.

Much of the system is old and needs to be replaced or is in a state of disrepair. A majority of the lighting units utilize mercury vapor luminaries, which are approaching the end of their service life. These units will either need to be retrofitted or replaced since state statute (M.S. 216C.19, subd. 1) prohibits doing anything other than minor repair or removal of lighting units which utilize mercury vapor luminaries.

The city anticipates that it will take \$15 million (2007 dollars) in capital expenditure to replace the entire system of 2300 Park Board lighting units and associated underground cabling on the 50+ miles of the Grand Rounds. The city has completed the replacement of approximately 10 miles of lights.

The project will replace a deteriorated lighting system that poses safety concerns with the frequency of light outages and equipment that has surpassed service life. The new lights are functionally more efficient with light output that provides greater visibility. This efficient lighting also provides a unique look on the parkways that enhances the features of the parkway system as well as respecting the science and the practice of roadway lighting. The new lighting will provide energy efficiency and be aesthetically attractive.

Total Project Cost: The total cost is \$15 million (2007 dollars) in capital expenditure to replace the entire system of 2,300 Park Board lighting units and associated underground cabling on the 50+ miles of the Grand Rounds. The city of Minneapolis has expended \$1.72 million of local funds from 2005-07 on the project. Future local funding will, at least, match non-city funding.

Other Considerations

This is an ongoing project. The project can be accomplished in phases with the next phase beginning in 2008, and being completed by 2112.

Project Contact Person: Grand Rounds Lighting

Steven Mosing
Traffic Parking Services Division
Minneapolis Public Works Department
300 Border Avenue North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405
Phone: (612) 673-5746

Email: steve.mosing@ci.minneapolis.mn.us.

Priority 3: Grand Rounds Scenic Byway Bridge Replacement

This request is for \$600,000 in 2008 (an an additional \$2.5 million in 2010) in state funding to acquire land, pre-design, design and construct the St. Anthony Parkway Bridge over the Burlington Northern Santa Fe's (BNSF's) Northtown Rail Yard. The Bridge is located in Northeast Minneapolis between California Street Northeast and Main Street Northeast (immediately west of University Avenue Northeast). This project will replace a vital link of

the "Grand Rounds – National Scenic Byway," improve the pedestrian walkways; and provide separate bicycle lanes not currently present. It will increase safety and improve the environment for pedestrians and non-motorized vehicle users.

St. Anthony Parkway and the Bridge are part of the city's "Grand Rounds – National Scenic Byway." The Grand Rounds has been recognized by the Federal Highway Administration as the premier National Urban Scenic Byway and is part of the regional parks and open space system. The bridge provides an important east/west access across 24 tracks into BNSF's Northtown Rail Yard. Unlike most parkway bridges, the St. Anthony Bridge carries a significant volume of car and truck traffic (4,200 ADT) due to the commercial businesses that have developed adjacent to the BNSF Rail Yard. The bridge is an integral part of the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway, which is also part of the metropolitan regional park system. The new bridge will also include a bike lane that will connect with the regional trail system.

The bridge has a sufficiency rating of 33.9 (well below 50 rating for bridges considered structurally deficient). The bridge superstructure is in an advanced state of deterioration and the existing bridge deck and sidewalks must be continuously maintained in order to keep them in a safe and usable condition. Routine maintenance is no longer feasible to provide this service. The current bridge consists of five trusses (span lengths of 102 to 116 feet, total span 525 feet) with the four piers located between 24 tracks into BNSF's Northtown Rail Yard.

This project was initially programmed for bridge rehabilitation. Federal funding was secured. BNSF has seen rapid rail traffic growth since the project scope was first developed. The cost of rehabilitating or replacing the bridge is significantly impacted by the logistics of working within the active rail yard. The original estimate undervalued this cost factor. During project development, analysis indicated that the additional required pier crash protection would cause the safe loading for the existing foundation to be exceeded. The foundation's load limitation also eliminated the possible addition of bicycle lanes on this important national scenic byway requiring bicyclists to leave the grade separated bicycle path and share the roadway with cars and trucks. The need for significant additional (and unavailable) local funds to rehabilitate the bridge and the inability to include bicycle lanes lead the city to release its FHWA Bridge Rehabilitation funding in August

2006. The city intends to reapply for bridge replacement funds this year. The city is continuing with the project pre-design using local funds with its Bridge Type Study nearing completion.

Total Project Cost: The total project cost to replace the bridge is \$16.3 million for all years. The city is contributing \$2.9 million and it will also receive \$9.5 million of federal funding and \$800,000 of other BNSF funds.

Other Considerations

The city anticipates making a request for \$2.5 million in state bonds in 2010 for this project.

The project will be owned and operated by the city of Minneapolis. The predesign and design will take place in 2009; right of way and easements in 2010; construction will start in April 2011; and construction completion is scheduled for November 2012.

Project Contact Person: Grand Rounds Bridge Replacement

Jack Yuzna, Principal Professional Engineer Minneapolis Public Works Department Room 204 City of Lakes Building 309 2nd Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401 Phone: (612) 673-2415

Fax: (612) 673-2048

Email: jack.yuzna@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Priority 4: Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) University Research Park

This request is for \$6.85 million in state funding for the first phase of the SEMI University Research Park project. The funds will be used to acquire land, pre-design, design and construct new storm water and roadway infrastructure for Granary Road. The roadway, which has been identified as a regional roadway by the Metropolitan Council will begin at Oak Street on the west and run to the city's eastern limits. Granary Road is one project of

several public infrastructure improvements critical to the development the University Research Park.

The area is a priority in the city of Minneapolis' efforts to increase its high-technology industrial workforce. The SEMI University Research Park area offers more than 500 acres of land prime for redevelopment – the largest open tract of land in the recent history of the city. It offers unique development opportunities due to its close proximity to the University of Minnesota and multiple Central Corridor LRT stations. The SEMI University Research Park is, along with adjacent property in St. Paul, a Minnesota Biosciences Sub-Zone and a federal Empowerment Zone.

Although the SEMI University Research Park offers a prime location, it has been beset by all of the traditional barriers to redevelopment. The area was once the transportation center for the commodities exchange that made Minneapolis the milling capital of the world. That industry left in its wake contaminated lands, train yards and grain elevators. Remediation of polluted sites, demolition of the obsolete and abandoned buildings and the need for significant roadway and storm water infrastructure improvements constitute costly roadblocks to redevelopment that the private sector will not bear.

The SEMI University Research Park area has the capacity to create 1,700 to 6,200 jobs and 680 to 1,000 new housing units. Included within this vision is the addition of 50 acres of parkland and open space, storm water ponds and rain gardens to improve the function of the storm water system and to add aesthetic amenities, pedestrian and bicycle trails that connect to the existing Grand Round system and roadway infrastructure that helps traverse the area to alleviate truck traffic from University Avenue Southeast. The city of Minneapolis is actively partnering with the city of St. Paul to find ways in which future the Granary Road could connect with that city's street system.

The project is of local, regional and statewide significance. It will alleviate traffic problems in the area and will provide an alternative route for University Avenue Southeast during the construction period for the proposed Central Corridor LRT line. The attendant SEMI University Research Park, which is within the Minneapolis portion of the state-designated Bioscience Zone, will strengthen the University of Minnesota by enhancing its ability to attract and retain quality professionals and students. It will also strengthen the state's economy by encouraging establishment and retention of technology based

business. The resulting increase in property values will enhance revenues for the state and all taxing jurisdictions.

Total Project Cost: The cost for all components of the SEMI project approximates \$71.1 million. For all components, the city expects to request a total of 28% of project costs from the state.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 1998 the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) awarded a \$460,000 redevelopment grant to the project. In 2000, the state-bonding bill appropriated funding for empowerment zone projects including the University Research ParK, but the funding was transferred in the 2005 bonding bill to the Heritage Park project. In 2006, DEED provided a \$1.0 million bioscience infrastructure grant for the project.

Other Considerations

The state-funded facilities will be owned and operated by the city of Minneapolis. A project schedule is outlined below:

2007-2008 Malcom Ave Extension, Storm water Phase I

2008-2009 25th Avenue Extension, Granary Road, Oak Street extension

2010 Storm water Phase 2 2011-2012 Kasota Avenue Extension

2012 West Bridge

2013-2014 Granary Road Extension to

Project Contact Person

Jim Forsyth, Project Coordinator Community Planning and Economic Development Room 600 Crown Roller Mill 105 5th Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Phone: (612) 673-5179

Email: jim.forsyth@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Kelly Moriarity, Engineer Minneapolis Public Works Room 300 City of Lakes Building309 2nd Avenue South Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Phone: (612) 673-3617

Email: kelly.moriarity@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Priority 5: Joint Training and Emergency Operations Center

This request is for \$13.59 million in state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new Joint Emergency Operations Center (EOC) for Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis. This joint EOC will be located at the Minneapolis Fire Training Campus on city owned land. The development and implementation of a dedicated EOC is vital to the city and county's ability to provide essential services during a disaster. An inadequate facility hampers and limits the effectiveness of the command structure; during an incident the coordination between various city/county departments and federal and state agencies is vital. Situated in an ideal location, the Minneapolis Fire Training Campus would provide a secure operations center with enough room to respond to a major incident affecting the county. Additionally this request would provide much needed training classrooms, as the Minneapolis Training Facility is the main site for training the State Structural Collapse Team.

Total Project Cost: \$27.403 million is the total cost for this project. Joint funding of 50% of project costs will come from Hennepin County in the amount of \$7.95 million and the city of Minneapolis in the amount of \$5.63 million.

Other Considerations

The city of Minneapolis will own the facility. The city in conjunction with the county will operate the facility. Construction crews will be on site starting June 2008 and construction will be completed in July 2009.

The city of Minneapolis has adopted by resolution (2006R-381) a policy relating to sustainability. The policy states that all new or significantly renovated municipal facilities (financed by the city and used by city departments) of 5,000 square feet or more, should be built to Leadership in

Energy and Environmental design (LEED Silver level of quality with emphasis in LEED points related to "energy and atmosphere" unless otherwise directed by the City Council. Prior to the adoption of the policy in July 2006, the city tested and piloted green building standards and methodology for such projects as the 1st and 3rd Police Precincts buildings, Fire Stations 6 and 14 and the Water Works. Currently the Hiawatha Public Works facility is being built in accordance with the policy. In fact the Hiawatha facility will be built to LEED's gold level of quality.

Project Contact Person

Rocco Forte, Director Emergency Management Room 401 PSC, 250 South 4th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Phone: (612) 673-3177

Email: rocco.forte@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Greg Goeke Public Works Property Services 350 South 5th Street, Room 223 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Phone: (612) 673-2706

Email: greg.goeke@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Priority 6: Hiawatha LRT Corridor

This request if for \$6.5 million for utility relocation, utility modernization, right-of-way acquisition for public infrastructure facilities and site improvements for several projects necessary to construct new infrastructure and remove barriers to transit supportive redevelopment at two rapidly developing station areas of the Hiawatha LRT Corridor in Minneapolis. These stations are located in south Minneapolis neighborhoods at Franklin Avenue and at 46th Street.

Franklin Avenue LRT Station Area

The Franklin-Cedar Riverside Transit-Oriented Development Master Plan, was adopted by the Minneapolis City Council in December 2001, and a

follow-up technical study, the Franklin Avenue LRT Station Area Development Implementation Plan, was completed in July 2005 to align public infrastructure planning and concept designs with redevelopment scenarios and phasing.

Based upon these plans, federal transportation funding has been competitively awarded through the 2005 Twin Cities regional transportation solicitation for major street intersection modifications and streetscape improvements to provide improved multi-modal (car, pedestrian, mike and bus) access around the station area, increase intersection safety and capacity, and support new access for higher density transit-supportive development sites close to the LRT station. Substantial local funding has also been committed to bring the total currently programmed for public investment in infrastructure modifications for transit supportive development infrastructure to over \$4.045 million.

Vigorous development is already underway in the Franklin Avenue LRT station area, with a total of 184 new housing units completed within one-half mile (walking distance) of the LRT station since 2000, and 227 units proposed by developers for construction within the next four years. The Franklin Avenue LRT Station Area Development Implementation Plan recognizes the potential for ad additional 700 housings units to be built in the station area along with supporting neighborhood retail services, if proposed infrastructure modifications and improvements are completed. These infrastructure investments are critical to facilitate improved public safety and access to the LRT station, connect the station into the fabric of the surrounding neighborhoods, and support higher intensity transit supportive development on under-utilized sites close the station.

This funding proposal requests \$1.5 million towards the planned infrastructure costs. Funding will be used to relocate several high voltage transmission poles during the construction of the new streets, and to fund acquisition of right-of-way for new street and utility infrastructure improvements.

46th Street LRT Station Area

The 46th and Hiawatha Station Area Master Plan was approved by the Minneapolis City Council in December 2001. This plan provides broad land use recommendations, development guidelines and infrastructure proposals

for the creation of pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use, transit-supportive neighborhood activity center around the 46th Street LRT station area. A technical implementation study to refine infrastructure concepts and developments scenarios, the 46th and Hiawatha Transit-Oriented Development Strategy, is currently underway utilizing funding from Minneapolis and the Metropolitan Council. This study will complete some of the project predesign phase.

Private development within walking distance of this LRT station has been strong, with 61 units completed since 2003, 194 units currently under construction, and an additional 66 units with development approvals already in place. Current land use plans anticipate an additional 500 housing units and significant neighborhood retail development if new street infrastructure and utility relocation is completed.

The station area master plan identifies the extension of Snelling Avenue south of 46th Street as a key infrastructure improvement for improving regional traffic safety and capacity on 46th Street and Hiawatha Avenue (Trunk Highway 55), as well as promoting transit-oriented development near the station. The city of Minneapolis has included \$1.543 million in capital funding for the construction of this segment of Snelling Avenue in its Capital Improvement Program, but has not yet identified funding sources for the right-of-way acquisition.

One of the major barriers to redevelopment at this station area is the large no-build zone required as setbacks to the existing high-voltage transmission towers. Although a newer and taller mono-pole system was installed by the state of Minnesota during the reconstruction of Highway 55 throughout the rest of the Hiawatha Corridor, in the segment around the 46th Street LRT station an older two-pole system was left in place.

This funding proposal requests \$5 million towards the installation of the new power line transmission towers near the 46th Street LRT station and the acquisition of right-of-way or easements for the new street and utility corridor in order to remove barriers to successful transit-supportive redevelopment within this station area. The narrowed utility corridor will also be designed and constructed to implement best practices in low impact storm water management, including a large public storm water amenity, and other infrastructure needed for station area redevelopment. The consolidated

public utility corridor will also be improved to create a public pedestrian and bike access corridor from 46th Street, near the LRT station, to Minnehaha Park, a major city and regional park facility.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$13.218 million. The non-state share of this project is \$6.718 million (or 51%), and \$5.718 has been committed:: \$2.727 million in federal funding; \$2.667 million from the city of Minneapolis; \$274,000 from Hennepin County; and \$50,000 from the Metropolitan Council.

Other Considerations

The city of Minneapolis will own the public facilities. The timeline of the project is outlined below:

Franklin Avenue Construction starts in March 2009 and will be completed

in July 2011.

46th Street Construction starts in September 2009 and will be

completed in July 2012.

Project Contact Person

Mark Garner, Senior Project Coordinator Community Planning and Economic Development 105 5th Avenue South, Suite 200 Minneapolis Minnesota 55401-2534

Phone: (612) 673-5037 Fax: (612) 673-5113

Email: mark.garner@ci.minneapolis.mn.us.

Priority 7: Minneapolis Police Department, Forensic Laboratory

This request is for \$2.7 million (\$12.3 million in 2010) in state funding for a project predesign for a forensic laboratory that is designed to meet both current and future spatial and functional needs of the Minneapolis Police Department. The state request would also be used to acquire a site for the facility. Currently, the Crime Lab Unit of the Minneapolis Police Department (with a staff of 29 employees) manages forensic laboratory functions in a

variety of spaces. The main laboratory and office space are located in Minneapolis City Hall. The Firearms/Tool Mark Section is located on the second floor of the Police Community Services Building with the ballistics testing water tank and bullet trap currently housed in the SWAT Garage (located in the basement of the Haaf Parking Ramp). In addition, the Crime Lab Unit operates the Forensic Garage located at the Minneapolis impound lot.

The deficiencies of the existing facilities in both space and function are such that there is a constant potential to compromise the integrity of the forensic work performed due to the possibility of cross-contamination of evidence. These deficiencies could also result in dangerous conditions that could impact the health and safety of employees. The existing lab space in City Hall totals less than 6,000 square feet with another 2,000 square feet of space at the Forensic Garage. Functionally, the laboratory spaces within City Hall were originally designed as offices, but have been converted for use as laboratory spaces. Consequently, the current facilities are lacking in actual laboratory space, deficient in heating, cooling, ventilation, emergency power and plumbing. Due to space limitations a number of laboratory functions are in a single room rather than separated, as they should be for both safety and evidentiary purposes. Given that forensic laboratory spaces are considered biohazard areas due to bloodborne pathogens and toxic chemicals, these are especially serious conditions.

The current facilities do not provide sufficient space for the required functions of a forensic laboratory. The U.S. Department of Justice recommends a standard for the size of forensic laboratories that is based on a ratio of 1,000 gross square feet per staff member. For Minneapolis, that formula would yield a recommended lab size of approximately 29,000 square feet. Combined with the typical support spaces found in this type of facility the proposed project would be approximately 38,000 square feet in size.

Recent trends in the field of forensic science and forensic lab design place an additional burden on inadequate and outdated crime labs. In recent years, defense attorneys have increasingly challenged crime labs to validate the handling of evidence and the results of forensic analysis. Because of these legal challenges, many crime labs have turned to a national accreditation process to establish the integrity of their forensic work. This national accreditation process of the American Society of Crime Laboratory

Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board (ASCLD/LAB) is based on both facility ratings and employee testing and is rapidly becoming the standard for best practice in forensic science. Further, accreditation of the forensic lab will enable the Minneapolis Police Department to apply for and receive additional state and federal grants in order to maintain accreditation long-term. The proposed project will be designed to the standards established by ASCLD/LAB.

The Minneapolis Crime Lab provides the forensic disciplines of crime scene processing, fingerprint analysis, computer forensics, video forensic analysis and firearm/tool mark examination. DNA analysis is not conducted, but is provided by the Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA) (there is currently a commitment in place for the Minneapolis Police Department to fund two DNA analysts within the BCA for dedication to Minneapolis cases.) The case workload of the Minneapolis Police Department Crime Lab is at a significantly higher level than that of the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office. Because the BCA and the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office are operating at or near caseload capacity neither agency has the ability to absorb the workload of Minneapolis with their current staffing and facilities.

Starting in 2005 and continuing to date, discussions between the Minneapolis Police Department and the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office related to forensic science services have resulted in the beginnings of a long term partnership. Currently, the Hennepin County Sheriff's Office Crime Lab is operating at or near caseload capacity. Therefore there is a potential for mutual benefit between the city and Hennepin County with the construction of a new facility. Those partnership discussions will continue as part of this project. Specifically, the subjects of co-location of facilities, sharing of lab spaces, transfer of lab functions between agencies and case load balancing will be included as part of the project.

Similar discussions related to long-term partnerships have also been initiated between the Minneapolis Police Department and Hamline University and Minneapolis Community and Technical College. The Crime Lab Unit of the Minneapolis Police Department has employed students as interns in the past and the design and construction of this facility would greatly enhance the opportunities for additional interns and due to the size and nature of the new facility potentially provide teaching opportunities that do not exist at the current facilities or at the higher education institutions.

In addition, the Minneapolis Police Department has been approached by the Target Corporation in regards to potential participation in the building of a new forensic lab. The Target Corporation has a long-standing commitment to community partnership in Minneapolis and Minnesota and contributed funds to the BCA lab located in Bemidji. Further discussion with Target will continue in the hopes of establishing a long-term relationship.

There are further opportunities for co-location with the Minneapolis Public Health Laboratory. The Health laboratory provides clinical, environmental and forensic chemical testing for the general public, private entities, and city, county and state agencies. The Health lab also provides forensic support for the Minneapolis Police Department for drug and blood-alcohol testing. The co-location of the laboratory with the proposed forensic laboratory would meet the demands of the Health Laboratory for upgraded space and air handling and would allow the Health lab employees to use many of the proposed building support features

High quality forensic science related to criminal investigation is a key to enhancing the Minneapolis Police Department's ability to prosecute crimes and secure convictions. The Minneapolis Police Department shall, by ensuring the integrity of forensic science through a modern ASCLD/LAB accredited forensic laboratory, increase the safety and confidence of visitors, workers, and the citizens of Minneapolis through effective and efficient law enforcement and prosecution.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$30 million. The city is contributing \$15 million.

Other Considerations

The city of Minneapolis will own and operate this facility.

The project schedule is:

Predesign Spring 2009
Site Acquisition January 2011
Design January 2011
Construction January 2012
Completion April 2014.

The city of Minneapolis has adopted by resolution (2006R-381) a policy relating to sustainability. The policy states that all new or significantly renovated municipal facilities (financed by the city and used by city departments) of 5,000 square feet or more, should be built to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver level of quality with emphasis in LEED points related to "Energy and Atmosphere," unless otherwise directed by the City Council. Prior to the adoption of the policy the city has tested and piloted green building standards and methodology for such projects as the 1st and 3rd Precinct buildings, Fire Stations 6 and 14, and the Water Works. Currently the Hiawatha Public Works facility is being built in accordance with the policy.

Project Contact Person

Sharon Lubinski Deputy Chief of Police Minneapolis Police Department Room 130 City Hall 350 South 5th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Phone: (612) 673-3553

Email: sharon.lubinski@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Paul D. Miller, Project Manager Property Services Minneapolis Public Works Department Room 223 City Hall 350 South 5th Street Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Phone: (612) 673-3606 Fax: (612) 334-1662

Email: paul.miller@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

Unprioritized Project: Orchestra Hall Redevelopment

This request for \$3 million in state funding will help the Minnesota Orchestral Association plan and pre-design for a redevelopment of Orchestra Hall at its current downtown Minneapolis location. These funds will be used to engage

a project manager, architect, acousticians and other professionals who will help us plan a more enticing and versatile concert hall for the people of Minneapolis.

Constructed as one of the community's major arts venues in 1974, Orchestra Hall serves as the center for all Minnesota Orchestra activities, including performances, rehearsals, recording and administrative operations. Orchestra Hall has served as a major downtown destination for the community, enjoyed by the nearly 500,000 audience members and 50,000 students who walk through its doors each year. As the building approaches 35-years of age, there are many necessary repairs and updates, as well as alterations to better meet the needs of today's concertgoers.

A fully integrated and modern Orchestra Hall will meet these needs critical to the Minnesota Orchestra's mission:

- ♦ Improve the audience experience
- ♦ Allow for the presentation of a broader range of music and events'
- ♦ Provide additional space for education and outreach programs
- ♦ Better integrate Orchestra Hall and Peavey Plaza into an updated vision for downtown Minneapolis.

A new and exhilarating design to Orchestra Hall will match the acclaimed artistic excellence of the Minnesota Orchestra and will further enrich the transformational experiences audiences have come to expect from this leading ensemble. In short, it will become the state's great concert hall.

Key elements of the project include:

Public lobby space. An expanded lobby will more than double in size, offering new and improved amenities, a café and coffee shop, increased lobby activities and open access to every member of the public. We expect this space will transform every individual's experience with the Minnesota Orchestra from the moment they open the doors of Orchestra Hall. Expanded space will also be available for the Minnesota Orchestra's significant educational offerings, as well as use by community groups.

Inside the Auditorium. The Orchestra Hall auditorium itself will receive a complete refurbishing, including new seating and improved sightlines. The most substantial change to the current auditorium will be a permanent choir

loft above the stage. When not in use by a choir, the loft will allow for 150 additional seats with close-up views of the musicians and conductor. The addition of the choral loft will push the stage forward, bringing the stage farther out into the Hall and closer to the audience. Up to two video screens will hang onstage for select concerts, providing audience members another view of the performers onstage. State-of-the-art sound and lighting equipment will be installed. Several adjustments will be made to improve onstage acoustics for musicians, and the auditorium's capabilities for amplified music.

Peavey Plaza. Orchestra Hall is currently located adjacent to Peavey Plaza, a city-owned park that features angular waterfalls and a reflecting pool. In its current form, Peavey Plaza does not adequately function as the city square it can and should be. At present, the Minnesota Orchestra primarily uses the space for three weeks each year for Sommerfest presentations. At the December 2006 annual meeting of the Minnesota Orchestral Association, Mayor R.T. Rybak challenged the Board and staff to make Peavey the crossroads of downtown, an energetic place where people gather and enjoy Minneapolis. Though the Minnesota Orchestral Association does not own this space, we look forward to working closely with the city of Minneapolis to ensure that the renovation of Orchestra Hall integrates gracefully with an updated Peavey Plaza.

The Minnesota Orchestra Association is committed to ensuring that the renovation enhances the Orchestra's statewide significance, along with improving the vitality of downtown Minneapolis.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$95 million. In addition to this current request, an estimated \$30 million in state bond funds will be requested in 2010. Other than the requested state bonding funds, we anticipate that all other funds raised for this project will be from private sources.

Other Considerations

The city of Minneapolis would own the facility, but the Minnesota Orchestral Association through an agreement with the city would operate the facility. The project construction schedule anticipates a June 2009 start with a August 2011 completion.

Project Contact Person

Laura Nichols-Endres Director of Government Relations Minnesota Orchestral Association 1111 Nicollet Mall Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403

Phone: (612) 371-5659
Fax: (612) 371-7170
Email: Inichols@mnorch.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Evaluation of Local Projects

To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed?
 Priority 1 Target Center Debt Reduction: The city is requesting that the state pay 100% of this project.

Priority 2 Grand Rounds Lighting: 60% of total project costs for all phases, across all biennia, are to be provided from non-state funding sources.

Priority 3 Grand Rounds Bridge: For the total cost of this bridge replacement 58% federal funding will be matched by 17% local funding, 5% private funding, and 20% state funding.

Priority 4 SEMI: 53% of the 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources.

Priority 5 Joint Training and Emergency Operations Center: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds.

Priority 6 Hiawatha LRT Corridor: 51% of project costs are to be provided from non-state government funds.

Priority 7 Minneapolis Police Department, Forensic Laboratory: \$2.7 million of \$2.8 million 2008 cost for land acquistion and predesign is requested from the state. When the subsequent 2010 phase of the project is added in, local funding sources are anticipated to provide 50% of the project's total funding of \$30 million.

Unprioritized Orchestra Hall project: This predesign phase of the project is 100% state-funded. When the subsequent 2010 phase is included, non-state funding sources are expected to provide 65% of the total project's funding.

Does project help fulfill an important state mission?
 Priority 1: The state mission in funding this municipal debt relief project is unclear.

Priority 2: Providing recreational opportunties is an important state mission. However, the degree to which these types of trail enhancement projects should be funded by the state is unclear.

Priority 3: Grand Round Bridge Replacement: Providing recreational and transportation safety is an important state mission. However, the extent to which local park bridge replacement is a state vs. local funding responsibility is unclear.

Priority 4: Transportation is an important state mission. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear.

Priority 5: Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear.

Priority 6: Transportation is an important state mission. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear.

Priority 7: Public safety laboratory facilities are an important state mission in Minnesota. However, the degree to which local projects should be funded, as contrasted with state projects, is unclear.

Unprioritized Orchestra Hall project: The state's role in funding projects similar to this request has varied considerably from biennium to biennium.

Is project of regional or statewide significance?
 Priority 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local, and indirectly a regional, benefit.

Priorities 2 and 3: The Grand Rounds projects appears to overlap a request made separately by the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board. Both of these projects are viewed primarily as having a regional benefit.

Priority 4: This project is viewed as having regional and statewide benefit.

Priorities 5 and 6: These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional benefit.

Priority 7: This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit.

Unprioritized Orchestra Hall project: This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit.

- Are new or additional state operating subsidies required?
 No.
- 5. Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? Priorities 1, 2 and 3: See #2 above.

Priority 4: No.

Priority 5: See #2 above.

Priority 6: No.

Priority 7: See #2 above.

Unprioritized project: Unclear.

6. Are inequities created among local jurisdictions?

Priority 1: If funded, other local governments could seek debt relief from the state for similar event center projects.

Priorities 2 through 7: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects.

Unprioritized project: If funded, other organizations could seek local government partners and request state funding for similar projects.

7. Does project compete with other facilities? Priority 1. Unclear.

Priorities 2 through 6: Not significantly.

Priority 7. The state operates two laboratories under the BCA at the Department of Public Safety.

Unprioritized project: Unclear.

- 8. Has local governing body provided a resolution of support?
 Yes; on June 29, 2007 the Minneapolis City Council adopted a resolution of support for all eight projects submitted to the state, and indicated its priority ranking for seven of the projects.
- Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting?
 The city of Minneapolis submitted a total of eight requests. Seven of these requests are prioritized. The city also requests funding for one unprioritized capital project.
- Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?

 Predesigns are not required for Priorities 1, 2, or 3.

Priority 4: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities.

Priority 6: A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways.

Predesigns for Priority 5, the Joint Emergency Operations Center, and Priority 7, the Forensic Laboratory, have not yet been submitted.

Unprioritized Project: The request to the state is for predesign funding.

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$20,700,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (MInneapolis Park & Rec Board)

PROJECT LOCATION: various locations in Minneapolis, in Hennepin cnty

Project At A Glance

Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board requests state funding for five capital projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$10 million in state funding, to pre-design, design, construct, furnish, equip and rehabilitate the Historic Grand Rounds Scenic Byway system.

 Note: The city of Minneapolis has also submitted bonding requests for two projects within the Grand Rounds system.
- ♦ \$2 million in state funding to replace eight playgrounds within the regional park system.
- ♦ \$1 million in state funding to pre-design, design, construct, furnish and equip for rehabilitation Father Hennepin (Bluffs) Regional Park.
- ♦ \$5 million in state funding to pre-design, design, construct, furnish, equip and related work for the Theodore Wirth Regional Park Winter Recreation Area and JD Rivers Children's Garden.
- ♦ \$2.7 million in state funding for pre-design, design, construction, furnishing, equipping, and related work for Health and Wellness Centers.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Grand Rounds Scenic Byway

This request is for \$10 million in state funding, to pre-design, design, construct, furnish, equip and rehabilitate the Historic Grand Rounds Scenic Byway system and related facilities located in Hennepin County, and in the city of Minneapolis. This project will include new parkway construction,

replacement of parkway paving, trails, signage, lighting, bridges, site furniture, parking areas, and related items.

This project is of regional, statewide and national significance. The Historic Grand Rounds, as part of the Metropolitan Council's regional parks in Minneapolis, receives over 13 million visits annually, bringing in an estimated \$40 million a year from visitors originating from the region, state, country and world. The history of the Grand Rounds is the history of the growth and expansion of our nation, coupled with the vision of the founders of the region who efforts spawned an industrial revolution on the Mississippi, spilling over the banks to the entire region.

In addition, the many visitors engage in various forms of recreation activities, which help greatly with the state's interest in fitness and wellness. For example, trails enable such activities as biking, hiking, walking, and running/jogging.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway project is \$48.33 million over the next three biennia (2008-2012). Of this amount, \$18.33 million will be provided from non-state funding.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board received \$250,000 in the 2006 legislative session for an alignment study for the Grand Rounds Missing Link in Northeast Minneapolis.

Other Considerations

Previous funds of \$4.5 million have already been contributed, primarily for earlier work on the system.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will own and operate all facilities with the exception of the St. Anthony Parkway Bridge, which the city of Minneapolis will own and operate.

Project Timeline:

Construction crews arrive on site: April 2009
Completion with certificate of occupancy: April 2011

Project Contact Person

Nick Eoloff, Project Manager, RLA Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2117 West River Road Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411-2227

Priority 2: Regional Park Playgrounds

This request is for \$2 million in state funding to replace eight playgrounds within the regional park system in Hennepin County, in the city of Minneapolis.

Play is the work of children. Playgrounds support a child's play by fostering physical activity, peaking imagination, forging social interaction, and facilitating exploration of the natural environment. These facilities help fight boredom and obesity, thus promoting childhood wellness.

Residents and visitors of Minnesota seek out Minneapolis parks as a destination or simply as a rest-stop on a long trip across the state. The Minneapolis regional park system receives over 13 million visits per year, making it well suited to provide premier playground facilities that reflect the passion and commitment the state holds for children, families, and parks.

The playgrounds will be replaced at the following locations: Lake Harriet Bandshell, Minnehaha Park (two in this location), Nokomis Park, Boom Island, Beard's Plaissance (west of Lake Harriet), Theodore Wirth Park, and the north shore of Lake Calhoun. Playgrounds currently in these locations are 30 to 40 years old. In many cases, they are not accessible and play features have been removed as they have become unsafe. After years of good service, refreshment of these facilities is necessary.

The design of eight new playgrounds or "play spaces" across the city will demonstrate best practices of well-balanced play areas that consider the needs of youth as well as their caregivers. These playgrounds will capture imagination, develop motor skills, forge a connection to the natural environment, provide kick-about space, and ensure comfortable accommodations for parents and caregivers. Ideas for these play spaces

range from interactive play features that introduce children to nature to features that evoke a sense of mystery and story telling.

For each playground site, the following will be evaluated and updated as necessary: play equipment, lighting, pathways, picnic tables, water fountain, shade structures, site furniture, signage, landscaping, turf improvements, and parking. All playgrounds will meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$2 million.

Other Considerations

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will own and operate all playgrounds.

Project Timeline:

Construction crews arrive on sites: April 2009
Completion with certificate of occupancy: April 2011

Project Contact Person

Andy Lesch, RLA, Park and Recreation Planner Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2117 West River Road Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411-2227

Phone: (612) 230-6438 Fax: (612) 230-6506

Email: alesch@minneapolisparks.org

Priority 3: Father Hennepin Regional Park Rehabilitation

This request is for \$1 million in state funding to pre-design, design, construct, furnish and equip for rehabilitation Father Hennepin (Bluffs) Regional Park, which is located in Hennepin County, and in the city of Minneapolis. This may include such projects as trails, signage, bridges, stairs, ramps, lighting, site furniture, and related items.

Father Hennepin Regional Park provides areas for picnicking, exercise and play. This project is of regional, statewide and national significance. This park is part of the Metropolitan Council's Central Riverfront Regional Park, and is also part of the historic Grand Rounds. The Central Riverfront Regional Park receives over 1.114 million visits annually, bringing in an estimated \$3.3 million a year from visitors originating from the region, state, country and world. The history of Father Hennepin and regional parks in Minneapolis is the history of the exploration and growth of our nation, coupled with the vision of the founders of the region.

Father Hennepin is named for Father Louis Hennepin, a Franciscan priest believed to have first viewed St. Anthony Falls in 1680 from the shore of this land mass. The park offers direct access to footpaths and bridges that display a unique view of the river gorge, the downtown skyline and the Stone Arch Bridge. Father Hennepin Regional Park also connects to the historic Stone Arch Bridge, built over 100 years ago to haul grain for the local mills at more competitive rates.

In reference to fitness and exercise, the park is situated on pedestrian and biking trails that wind through the Central Riverfront in downtown Minneapolis. This affords many fitness opportunities for the visitors, workers, and the 30,000 downtown residents, who are drawn to the area for its beautiful vistas and natural amenities on the Mississippi River.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$1 million.

Other Considerations

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will own and operate all facilities.

Project Timeline:

Construction crews arrive on site: April 2009
Completion with certificate of occupancy: April 2011

Previous development was partly funded with Metropolitan Council regional park funds.

Project Contact Person

Nick Eoloff, Project Manager, RLA Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2117 West River Road Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411-2227

Phone: (612) 230-6465 Fax: (612) 230-6506

Email: neoloff@minneapolisparks.org

Priority 4: Theodore Wirth Regional Park Rehabilitation: Winter Recreation and JD Rivers Children's Garden

This request is for \$5 million in state funding to pre-design, design, construct, furnish, equip and related work for the Theodore Wirth Regional Park Winter Recreation Area and JD Rivers Children's Garden and related facilities to be located in Hennepin County, and in the city of Golden Valley. The winter recreation area may include such projects as snow guns, infrastructure, trails and runs, equipment, shelter, warming and equipment buildings, lighting, site furniture, and related items to support such activities as tubing, cross country skiing, and snow boarding.

The JD Rivers Children's Garden will educate urban youth as to where our food really comes from and how it is grown, through facilities that support hands on programs and activities. Kids will be able to actually consume what they grow and will learn about planting and plant care in relation to the weather and environment.

This project is of regional to state significance and beyond, as the park attracts over 442,000 visitors annually. It is also located in an area of economically disadvantaged populations who need additional positive recreation experiences.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$5 million.

Other Considerations

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will own and operate all facilities.

Project Timeline:

Construction crews arrive on site: April 2009
Completion with certificate of occupancy: April 2011

Part of this project has utilized operations and maintenance funds for regional parks (from the Metropolitan Council).

Project Contact Person

Deb Boyd, Landscape Architect Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2117 West River Road Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411-2227

Phone: (612) 230-6460 Fax: (612) 230-6506

Email: dboyd@minneapolisparks.org

Priority 5: Health and Wellness Centers

This request is for \$2.7 million in state funding for pre-design, design, construction, furnishing, equipping, and related work for Health and Wellness Centers. Facilities are to be located in Hennepin County, and in the city of Minneapolis. The centers will be additions to current Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board neighborhood/community recreation centers. This will enable us to take advantage of other support facilities already there, with the funds focused on the Health and Wellness Centers.

The recreation centers to which these new Health and Wellness Centers will be added have not yet been selected. (Existing recreation centers can typically have in the range of 3,000 to 10,000 square feet.)

The new Health and Wellness Centers are projected to comprise around 3,000 square feet each (for a total of 9000 square feet), and will be designed

for use by all populations. There will be a focus on combating childhood obesity with fitness/aerobics equipment and programs designed to stress healthy lifestyles.

This focus will ultimately save the state and employers large amounts of money to address health problems, a very modest investment to save much more money later. Such a program is of state significance and beyond, as health care related costs continue to escalate dramatically for all people and organizations. The program will set an excellent example of the proactive and preventive steps that can help to reduce such upwardly spiraling costs.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project will be \$2.7 million.

Other Considerations

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will own and operate all facilities.

Project Timeline:

Construction crews arrive on site: April 2009
Completion with certificate of occupancy: April 2011

Project Contact Person

John Monnens, Registered Architect Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board 2117 West River Road Minneapolis, Minnesota 55411-2227 Email: jmonnens@minneapolisparks.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 38% of total project costs for 2008-2012 will be provided | |
| | from non-state funding sources. | |
| | Priorities 2-5: No non-state funding sources have been identified in | |
| 2. | the project request information. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Priorities 1-4: Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission. In the seven-county metropolitan area, the Metro Parks and Open Space Commission advises the Met Council on parks and open space projects. These requested projects should be considered alongside other metropolitan area parks requests. | |
| _ | Priority 5: The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? Priorities 1-4: These projects are viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. The Grand Rounds project request appears to complement, and perhaps overlap, a bonding request made separately by the city of Minneapolis. | |
| | Priority 5: The Health and Wellness Center projects appear to have primarily local benefit, similar to the current Park and Rec Board neighborhood and community recreation centers. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? Priorities 1-5: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? Priorities 1-5: See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? Priorities 1-4: The number of this type of local request suggests that additional requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if the state provides funding for these projects. | |
| | Priority 5: This request is for an uncommon project; it does not compare to most other submitted local capital funding requests. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Priorities 1-4: Not significantly. Priority 5: Unclear. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Minneapolis Park Board adopted a resolution of support for the five requested projects on June 20, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. | |

Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?
 Predesign submittals are not required for most of the requested projects. Where a predesign is required, it has not yet been submitted to the Department of Administration.

Minnesota Valley RRA: Railroad Rehab - Phase V

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$15,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Minn Valley Regional Rail Authority)

PROJECT LOCATION: Carver, Sibley, Redwood, Renville, Yellow Med cnty

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$15 million to rehabilitate railroad track from 3 miles west of Hamburg to Hanley Falls with 115-pound rail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$15 million in 2008 (and an additional \$15 million in 2010) to rehabilitate railroad track from three miles west of Hamburg, Minnesota to Hanley Falls, Minnesota with 115-pound rail.

This project will have a regional impact in that it is a portion of a 94.4-mile short line railroad traversing five counties — Carver, Sibley, Renville, Redwood, and Yellow Medicine. It will also have a statewide significance because it will provide transportation to move agricultural products including biodiesel and ethanol from farm to factory to market in south central and southwest Minnesota. Specifically, this will provide the needed upgraded track to transport ethanol from an existing facility located in Winthrop, Minnesota, which has expanded to a 100 million gallons of ethanol production per year.

This project is an expansion that will help fulfill the increase from 10 percent to 20 percent blended fuel usage in Minnesota passed during the 2005 Legislative Session as initiated by Governor Pawlenty. It also provides transmission of renewable energies to help meet the "25 x 25" Initiative and is expected to provide for transport of the following commodities from this

Winthrop site (Heartland Corn Products) alone, not including balance of shipments on the line:

- ♦ 2,500 cars of DDGs (dried distillers grains) outbound
- ♦ 2.500 cars of Ethanol outbound
- ♦ 150 cars of denatured alcohol inbound
- 1,500 cars of corn − inbound

This alone will reduce truck traffic by four times that amount. This will also result in reducing highway deterioration on not only CSAH highways but state trunk highways as well. This will be achieved and as of this date, five unit trains of ethanol have been shipped to California (150 million gallons) plus four unit trains of DDGs.

Agreements are in place with Home Farms Technologies of Brandon, Manitoba, Canada and Central Bi-Products in Redwood Falls to process 5,000 tons per day of municipal solid waste. The energy derived will provide steam, electricity to the plant, and reduce their need for natural gas dependency thus a savings of \$10 million per year in non-renewables. Additional by-products will be generated for use in the agricultural communities, anhydrous ammonia, ethanol, etc. The ash generated from gasification of municipal solid waste can be used for the production of cement. Negotiations are underway in the formation of a company to manufacture cement products.

This necessary rehab will result in a safer and secure transportation route and allow the incorporation of unit-train shipments.

Key for further economic development projects, which are located along the rail line as well as future JOBZ development in the 15 communities along the rail. The increase in speed will provide the ability to haul higher volumes of grain, kaolin clay, aggregate, cannery goods, and other bulky or large volume goods at competitive cartage prices.

MVRRA along with Region 9 and TC&W completed a rail study in 2005, which identified potential additional shippers who would use the line for inputs and outputs when the line is brought up to speed and able to move cars at 25mph. We can provide this report to you at your request.

Minnesota Valley RRA: Railroad Rehab - Phase V

Total Project Cost: The MVRRA is requesting state bond funding of \$15 million in 2008, and anticipates requesting an additional \$15 million in 2010. The MVRRA has also made a 2007 federal appropriation request for an additional \$20 million

Previous Appropriations for this Project

- ♦ 2002: Phase 1 Rehabilitation:
- \$4,800,000 Minnesota Rail Service Improvement Service (Minnesota Department Freight, Rail, and Waterways)
- ♦ \$600,000 MinnRail Shippers Association Loan to MVRRA
- \$600,000 Minnesota Prairie Line loan to MVRRA
 - ⇒ \$6,000,000 Total Phase 1 0% interest free revolving loans
 - ⇒ \$1,000,000 Federal grant from FRA

2004: Phase 2 Rehabilitation

 \$1,987,000 Federal Grant from FRA from North Redwood Falls to Hamburg, Minnesota

2007: Phase 3 Rehabilitation

- ♦ \$2,000,000 Federal Grant from FRA for work from Morton to Hanley Falls, Minnesota
- ♦ \$1,495,000 = State Bonding (\$1M) and \$495,000 Federal grant for work done Hamburg west three miles

Other Considerations

Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority will own the facility and Minnesota Prairie Line will operate the facility.

Construction crews are expected to first arrive on site 5-1-2009 and will be completed with a certificate of occupancy 12-1-2009

Project Contact Person

Julie Rath, MVRRA Administrator PO Box 481 – 200 South Mill Street Redwood Falls, Minnesota 56283

Phone: (507) 637-4084 Fax: (507) 637-4082

Email: Julie@redwoodfalls.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Minnesota Valley RRA: Railroad Rehab - Phase V

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? No non-state funds are identified in the project request information |
| | for 2008 and 2010 costs. (The MVRRA narrative indicates that \$20 |
| | million federal funding has been requested, but it is unclear to which |
| | part of Phase V those funds would be applied.) |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation and economic development are important state |
| | missions. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors |
| | are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| 4. | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| 5. | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | This rail line may compete somewhat with other rail facilities or with other freight modes. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, resolutions of support from the Minnesota Valley Regional Rail |
| | Authority, and from the county boards of each of the member |
| | counties (Carver, Redwood, Renville, Sibley and Yellow Medicine) |
| 0 | have been received. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| 10. | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for this type of project. |
| | |

Moose Lake: Wastewater Collection & Treatment Facility

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,600,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Moose Lake)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Moose Lake, in Carlton County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$2.6 million to acquire land, predesign, design and construct an administration facility and stabilization pond construction for the city of Moose Lake and Moose Lake - Windemere Sanitary Sewer District Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facility Project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2.6 million to acquire land, pre-design, design and construct an administration facility and stabilization pond construction for the city of Moose Lake and Moose Lake - Windemere Sanitary Sewer District Wastewater Collection and Treatment Facility Project. While we understand and appreciate that only one-half of our total request can come from the 2008 Capital Budget, we also respectfully request a direct appropriation of \$2.6 million from the general fund of the state of Minnesota for the following reasons:

The city of Moose Lake is a small rural regional center that is located in east central Minnesota, serving the southern half of Carlton County and the northern half of Pine County. What makes Moose Lake unique is that we truly are a 'rural regional center' for commerce, education, medical services, tourism and employment - for example, there are two expansive Minnesota state operated facilities; a regional medical hospital and surgical center; a regional school district that are all located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the city of Moose Lake and account for more than 1,600 permanent, well paying jobs.

While this statistic is impressive, one of Moose Lake's problems is that according to the Carlton County Assessor's Office, approximately 82 percent of the land area within the corporate boundaries of the city is tax-exempt, and 75 percent of the total property value is also exempt from taxation - in other words, one fourth of the property within the city of Moose Lake is paying for 100 percent of the cost of providing basic municipal services for the entire region. According to the Minnesota State Demographer's Office, the population that calls Moose Lake 'home' is estimated to be 2,490 - however, when you subtract the 'inmates' and 'patients' incarcerated in both of the state operated facilities, the actual population that calls Moose Lake 'home' is approximately 1,400 people, comprised of 602 households. Needless to say, the impact on this small grouping of taxable properties to fund law enforcement, fire protective services, public library services, etc., is tremendous and almost to the point of being unbearable.

A new opportunity and a "new risk" to the city of Moose Lake has recently materialized when it was announced that the Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS) facilities housing the Minnesota Sex Offender Program (MSOP) would be expanding and that Phase I of the expansion would house an additional 550 'patients.' Furthermore, the state of Minnesota has announced that a second DHS-MSOP expansion has been approved and when constructed the facility would house an additional 400 'patients'. In addition to the projected increases in the number of 'civilly committed patients' served by DHS-MSOP, the increased staffing requirements will generate 650 new employment opportunities under the Phase I development program and an additional 450 new employment opportunities will be provided under Phase II of the state development program.

It is interesting to note that at the completion of the Phase I and Phase II expansions, the total number of people housed within these expanded facilities will be more than the number of people that call Moose Lake their home and live outside of the secured facilities. In other words, the Department of Corrections (DOC) and DHS-MSOP facilities will become a virtual 'city within a city' and the demand load of the state facilities on the regional sanitary sewer system will far exceed fifty percent of the total effluent treated.

Moose Lake: Wastewater Collection & Treatment Facility

Furthermore, it is rumored that DHS-MSOP is in the planning stages for a Phase III expansion, which would account for the addition of another 400 'patients' and an additional 400 new employees being added to the mix. It is also rumored that the DOC is also anticipating the construction of three new buildings that would replace several current, antiquated facilities, which would increase the inmate population by an additional 600 persons, and would increase the DOC staffing levels by an additional 150 employees.

This request asks the state to assist the city of Moose Lake and pay 'up front' rather than 'over time.' The request would eliminate the need to finance the required system betterments and improvements over a protracted period of time and be billed for treatment costs and debt service. It has been estimated that if the city of Moose Lake does not receive an appropriation from the 2008 Capital Budget, and if other forms of grants and/or no-interest or low-interest loans are not forthcoming, the monthly sewerage costs that will have to be absorbed by the DOC and DHS-MSOP programs as part of their general operating budgets could exceed \$70,000 per month for the two facilities. From the city's perspective, 'but for' the rapid expansion of the DHS-MSOP facilities, the city of Moose Lake would not anticipate nor would it be required to expand the present system into the foreseeable future.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this wastewater project is \$5.1 million. The city would seek funding of \$2.5 million for the project, which is currently 18th on the Intended Use Plan.

Other Considerations

The city of Moose Lake will own and operate, as it does today, the sanitary sewer facilities within its jurisdictional boundaries and will continue, under contract, to treat the effluent of the Moose Lake Township - Windemere Township Sanitary Sewer District; the Department of Corrections Facility, Moose Lake; and the Department of Human Services, Minnesota Sex Offender Program, Moose Lake.

Bidding will be concluded in April of 2008 and construction would begin in June of 2008. The start-up of the Collection System is scheduled for October of 2008, with construction being initiated in the summer of 2009. Final start-up of the expanded treatment system(s) is scheduled for spring of 2010.

Project Contact Person

Mr. Gregory W. Stoewer, P.E. LHB, Inc. 21 West Superior Street, Suite 500

Duluth, Minnesota 55802 Phone: (218) 279-2464 Fax: (218) 727-8456

Email: greg.stoewer@lhbcorp.com

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

Moose Lake: Wastewater Collection & Treatment Facility

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? The city is asking for 100% state funding. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Maintaining or improving infrastructure related to water quality is an important state mission. The state has an existing program to provide financial assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit, although it does also impact state agency operations in the area. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? This project could have ongoing operating budget cost implications for the Departments of Human Services and Corrections, both of whom have facilities in Moose Lake. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? No. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? A draft of a resolution for the project, considered by the Moose Lake City Council on June 13, 2007, has been received. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |

Moose Lake Water & Light Cmssn: So. Substation

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Moose Lake Water & Light Cmssn)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Moose Lake, in Carlton County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$3 million to expand the South Substation in the city of Moose Lake, to provide additional electrical service that will be required for planned expansions of the state facilities at Moose Lake.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3 million to the city of Moose Lake and Moose Lake Water & Light Commission for the South Substation Expansion Project. Recently it was announced that the Minnesota Department of Human Services facilities housing the Minnesota Sex Offender Program [MSOP] would be expanding. Sebesta Blomberg and Associates has been asked to prepare a preliminary cost estimate for upgrades to the South Substation and the MSOP feeder. The cost estimate is based on information provided by Moose Lake Water and Light and the following:

- ◆ There will be an expansion of the existing MSOP, which will add 1.8 MW of load in 2008 to an existing load of approximately 0.8 MW. A dedicated feeder will serve the MSOP after the new expansion.
- The existing peak demand on the South Substation is 3,256 kW.

With the MSOP expansion in the year 2008, Moose Lake's South Substation will exceed the level of reserve capacity with a total predicted load of 5,341 kW. Because of the load growth, there is a need to increase the capacity of the existing South Substation by the summer of 2008. The concept design is to add a second 5/6.25 MVA transformer to the south substation. The

estimated future peak demand at the South Substation is 9129 kW. Between the top transformer rating of either transformer (6250 kVA) or the engine generators (4000 kW) there will be no issue serving the estimated future peak demand of 9129 kW.

Sebesta Blomberg also looked at the MSOP expansion from a feeder-loading standpoint. It was brought to Sebesta Blomberg's attention that MSOP would like a dedicated feeder. Not only would there be a cost to upgrade the feeder to handle the increased load, but there would also be a cost associated with increased conductor size to feed existing loads. On 6-19-07 a special meeting was called by the Moose Lake Water & Light Commission for the purpose of reviewing the proposed Electric Utility Master Plan as developed by Sebesta Blomberg's Project Engineer. After the presentation, suggestions were made and a Final Master Plan and course of action was agreed upon.

The total estimate of probable cost is \$2,436,000. This estimate does not include approximately \$700,000 for a fourth generator to supply power to the main wastewater lift station, to bring generators to compliance to the new emission standards, and inflation costs.

Total Project Cost:

The total project costs will exceed the \$3 million. The city is requesting state funding to cover all project costs.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The South 5/6.25 MVA Substation was constructed in 1993 to accommodate the electrical power requirements for the state of Minnesota's new missions-the Department of Corrections (DOC) Facilities and Department of Human Services (DHS) Sexual Offenders Program Facilities. The total local cost was \$880,000. (Note: The local bonds have been paid for, but the \$440,000 taken from the commissions reserves have not been replaced to-date. The state of Minnesota deeded the site over to the city of Moose Lake.) The Moose Lake DOC and the Moose Lake DHS were responsible for the costs of connecting the South Substation to their sites.

Moose Lake Water & Light Cmssn: So. Substation

Other Considerations

One of the Moose Lake Water & Lights Commission's goals is to have contingency plans for a target reliability of +99 percent. In 2005, two 2000 kW Generators were added to the South Substation and a state-of-the-art Distribution Control Panel were installed at a cost of approximately \$2 million, and financed by local bonds.

The city of Moose Lake, Minnesota, will own and the Moose Lake Water & Light Commission will operate, as it does today – under M.S. sections 412.321 to 412.191.

The preliminary start-up of the electrical service to the new site is scheduled for June of 2007. Project construction start date of August 2007 and phased project construction scheduled end date of November 2010.

Project Contact Person

Mr. Manny Day, P.E. Sebesta Blomberg 2381 Rosegate Roseville, Minnesota, 55113 Phone: (651) 634-7300 Cell: (612) 845-6389

Fax: (651) 634-7400

Website: http://www.sebesta.com

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Moose Lake Water & Light Cmssn: So. Substation

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | The Water and Light Commission is asking for 100% state funding. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state mission in directly providing funding for electrical |
| | substation expansion is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit, although it |
| | does also impact state agency operations in the area. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | This project could have ongoing operating budget cost implications |
| | for the Departments of Human Services and Corrections, both of whom have facilities in Moose Lake. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| J. | Potentially. State general obligation bonds are not typically used to |
| | finance this type of project. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | No. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Moose Lake City Council adopted a resolution of support |
| | on June 13, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? N/A |
| 10. | 1 41 1 |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for this type of project. |
| <u> </u> | i reading not required for tino type of project. |

Mt. Lake: Fire and Ambulance Facility

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$539,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Mt. Lake)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Mountain Lake, in Cottonwood County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$539,000 in matching state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new fire and ambulance facility in the city of Mountain Lake, Cottonwood County, Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$539,000 in matching state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new fire and ambulance facility in the city of Mountain Lake, Cottonwood County, Minnesota.

The Mountain Lake Fire Department serves the city of Mountain Lake, 117 sections in five townships by contract and has mutual aid agreements with Butterfield, Comfrey, Darfur, Jeffers, Jackson, Storden, Odin, Ormsby, Westbrook and Windom Fire Departments.

The Mountain Lake Ambulance Department serves the city of Mountain Lake, three cities (Comfrey, Bingham Lake and Butterfield) and 226 sections in nine townships by contract and has mutual aide agreements with Jackson, Jeffers, Springfield, Westbrook, and Windom Ambulance departments, and Gold Cross. Mountain Lake Fire and Ambulance also serve the estimated 5,000 vehicles that drive Highway 60 each day.

A new facility will enable fire and ambulance to respond to the changing demands of homeland security and renewable energy. The number of wind turbines in the area continues to increase. The city-owned Mountain Lake Utilities wind turbine will be operational in July 2007 and an ethanol plant east of Mountain Lake is scheduled to open in 2009. New renewable energy facilities coupled with the demands of existing wind turbine fields and the POET Biorefining ethanol plant in Bingham Lake (six miles away) require the Mountain Lake Fire and Ambulance departments to re-evaluate their services and consider different, and usually larger, equipment. Homeland security priorities, as established by federal and state agencies, are also impacting fire and ambulance equipment purchases. Fire and ambulance departments in the region are increasing working together to share resources to address these issues.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$1.077 million. The city will not be requesting additional funding for this project in future capital appropriations. Non-state funds for the project will be city property taxes and a portion of the township contract fees. The city will also be contributing the property on which the facility will be built.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by the city of Mountain Lake and operated by the Mountain Lake Fire and Ambulance departments.

Project Contact Person

Wendy Meyer City Administrator Box C

Mountain Lake, Minnesota 56159 Phone (507) 427-2999 Ext. 1

Fax: (507) 427-3327

Email: city@mountainlake.govoffice.com

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Mt. Lake: Fire and Ambulance Facility

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | No. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Mt. Lake City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 20, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| | |

Nassau: Nassau Fire Station

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$250,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Nassau)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Nassau, in Lac qui Parle County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$250,000 in state funding to complete pre-design, design, construction, furnish and equip a new fire station for the city of Nassau.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$250,000 in state funding to complete pre-design, design, construction, furnish and equip a new fire station for the city of Nassau. The new fire station will be located on three city-owned lots. The city-owned lots for the new fire station are located right off the major roadway running through the community, County Road 24 in Lac qui Parle County.

The new fire station would include two bays, a bathroom, and an office. The new structure would incorporate bays large enough to hold all four of the city's fire trucks as the current station only holds three; lockers to hold fire gear for 18 volunteer firefighters and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) equipment. Money included in this request would be used for fixtures such as the lockers to hold fire and EMS gear and a drying rack for fire hoses.

The current fire station in Nassau has out-lived its operational life and has begun to cost the city approximately \$500 per month during winter months to keep it heated. In addition to inefficient heating costs, the current fire station has become dilapidated and no longer meets the spatial needs of the department. The 40-year-old structure does not have long-term expansion capabilities and therefore is not an alternative to meet the current needs of

the department. The proposed fire station if constructed properly would last the city at least another 50 years.

The current fire station garages are very small making it impossible for firefighters to board fire trucks while they are in the garage. The "equipment" room is also very small and does not provide a layout that allows firefighters to access their gear quickly. The new station layout would allow for quick and easy access to gear and fire trucks.

The fire department would easily be able maintain and more than likely improve their response times to emergencies due to the new location's access to main roads and the improved access to equipment. Anything that can improve the response time of emergency personal will inevitably mean better protection of both life and property. The new fire station would serve as a symbol of this protection in the community.

The Nassau Fire Department has mutual aid agreements with all of the surrounding cities and counties both in Minnesota and South Dakota. The department's primary service area includes a 30-mile radius. The mutual aid agreements make the Nassau Fire Department an important resource not only to the community but to the entire region as well.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$250,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Nassau will own, operate, and maintain the fire station for which funding has been requested.

Construction will commence in July 2008 and conclude in October 2008.

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Narrative

Nassau: Nassau Fire Station

Project Contact Person

Roger Schuelke, Firefighter 2747 111th Avenue Marietta, Minnesota 56257 Phone: (320) 668-2532

Fax: (320) 289-1983 (UMVRDC) Email: schlkefm@fermerstel.net

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Nassau: Nassau Fire Station

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | The city is requesting 100% state funding. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Nassau City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | June 4, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| 40 | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the | |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. | |

New York Mills: Water and Sewer Improvements

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$991,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (New York Mills)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of New York Mills, in Otter Tail County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$991,250 in state funding to help fund the 2008 and 2009 items in our five-year capital improvement plan. These items have projected total costs of \$2.285 million. They are all improvements to water and sewer infrastructure and are integral components in our wastewater treatment expansion project scheduled for completion during 2007.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$991,250 in state funding to help fund the 2008 and 2009 items in our five-year capital improvement plan. These items have projected total costs of \$2.285 million. They are all improvements to water and sewer infrastructure and are integral components in our wastewater treatment expansion project scheduled for completion during 2007.

New York Mills is a growing city. This project has significant local impact, as without the wastewater expansion project we were at or near capacity in our wastewater treatment facility. In fact, the state is allowing no additional hookups in Phase II of our housing development until the wastewater expansion project is completed later this year. Infrastructure in many areas in this city is quite old and in a deteriorating condition. The city has already completed infrastructure projects in several neighborhoods, is nearing completion on the expansion project, and has a five-year plan for infrastructure projects in additional neighborhoods with deteriorating infrastructure in the water/sewer lines. This is a long-term project, which began in the late 1990's and will continue at least through 2012 under our current five-year plan. While our

residents are benefiting from the improvements already made, the tax burden on area residents continues to climb. Appropriation of state funds would help to ensure that our town could continue to replace its aging sewer and water lines. Our city has already invested a considerable amount of resources to our entire water and wastewater system with the improvements made to date and the significant expansion currently under construction.

New York Mills is home to the nationally recognized New York Mills Regional Cultural Center, which hosts the annual Great American Think-Off. A local group of residents hosts a large motorcycle ride fundraiser each June which provides money to the Ronald McDonald House, raising more than \$83,000 at its ride earlier this month. We have seven TIF districts, our industrial park is full, our housing development is in its second phase, and we have numerous employers including Lund Boats and Midstate Auto Auctions in our town. Several new businesses have been started in New York Mills in recent years, including Residential Wind Power, Kris Blackburn C.P.A., Straightline Graphics, Subway, Suns Up Salon, the Mills Creamery, Nelson Home (group/assisted living), Mills Movies, Sharehouse/Stepping Stones facility, Sign's Plus, Miriam's Massage, New York Mills Family Spine Clinic, numerous daycares, R&K Service Center, and Designs by Tes, along with major expansions by Lund Boats, IFS, Inc., Midstate Auto Auctions, and the Lucky Strike Bar & Grill/Mills Lanes. In addition, a major expansion is underway by the local MeritCare Clinic. Many new housing units have been added in town, including apartment buildings, townhomes, condominiums and single-family houses.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost for this project is \$5.375 million over the next three biennium.

| 2008 | City/assessments | \$1,293,750 |
|------|------------------|-------------|
| 2010 | City/assessments | \$817,500 |

Otter Tail County \$994,000 (county hwy project)

2012 City/assessments \$592,500

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This is part of the city's ongoing project involving a major expansion of our wastewater treatment facilities, at a projected cost of more than \$4.3 million. This project, slated for completion in 2007, was funded in part with a loan

New York Mills: Water and Sewer Improvements

from the Minnesota Public Finance Agency and in part from a state of Minnesota Small Cities Development Program grant, and the balance with rates and fees assessed residents. Earlier infrastructure improvement projects related to the sewer and water systems have been paid for with bonding; sources of repayment on the bonds is special assessments and the city's general tax revenues.

Other Considerations

The city of New York Mills owns the water and sewer utilities and all related infrastructure, capital equipment, land, and buildings.

Project Contact Person

Al Holtberg, City Public Works Director City of New York Mills PO Box H New York Mills, Minnesota 56567

Phone: (218) 385-2213 Fax: (218) 385-2315

City Clerk Darla Berry nymclerk@lakesplus.com

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

New York Mills: Water and Sewer Improvements

| Entrate disciplination | | |
|------------------------|---|--|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 67% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the New York Mills City Council adopted a resolution of support | |
| | on June 19, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |

Nisswa: Nisswa Lake Park & Beach Acquisition & Dev.

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,785,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Nisswa)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Nisswa, in Crow Wing County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1.785 million in state funding for acquisition and development of Nisswa Lake Beach and Park and a pedestrian bridge crossing state Highway 371.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Nisswa is requesting \$1.785 million in state funding to acquire property on Nisswa Lake for a public park and beach; final design of the park and beach; construction of infrastructure, pedestrian bridge feasibility study, facilities, and parking areas for the park and beach area to be located on Nisswa Lake, off of Hazelwood Drive, in the city of Nisswa.

On 6-1-07 Arnold Johnson Properties, LLC purchased approximately 15 acres with 1,500 feet of shoreline on Nisswa Lake. The intent of the landowner is to sell four acres to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for a public access and four acres to the city of Nisswa for a recreational park and beach. This is the last undeveloped piece of property of this size in the city of Nisswa on the Gull Lake Chain of Lakes.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$4,385,000. For 2008:

- ◆ Acquisition of 3-4 acres on Nisswa Lake, Land Acquisition Cost of \$1,200,000 (Based on 2006 appraised value of \$300,000 per acre).
- Feasibility Study for pedestrian bridge, \$15,000

- Infrastructure and facilities for recreational park and beach area, \$550,000.
- ◆ Furniture/Fixtures/Equipment Park and Beach, \$10,000
- ♦ Pre-design of Bridge, \$10,000

Previous Appropriations for this Project

These are funds that have already been allocated or are in the process of being applied for:

- ◆ City of Nisswa: conceptual design of Nisswa Lake Park and Beach prepared by Widseth Smith Nolting (WSN), \$5,000 (paid for and completed)
- ◆ Initiative Foundation: Planning Grant \$5,000 \$7,500, (in process of applying for)
- Parks and Trail Council of Minnesota: trail connecting the Paul Bunyan State
- ◆ Trail to the Nisswa Lake Park and Beach, \$25,000 \$35,000 (in process of applying for)
- DNR Grants (in process of applying for)
- ◆ Lakes Area Lions Club in process of working with them for donation of a gazebo and volunteer labor
- ♦ Nisswa Chamber of Commerce
- Private Donors A fund has been setup for private donations for the project

Other Considerations

The city of Nisswa will own, maintain, and operate the Nisswa Lake Recreational Park and Beach facility.

In 2010, \$2.6 million in state funding will be requested for design, construction and Right-of-Way acquisition of a pedestrian bridge crossing 371 for pedestrians and bikers to safely cross from the Nisswa Lake Park and Beach to downtown Nisswa and the Paul Bunyan State Trail in the city of Nisswa. Currently pedestrians are able to cross at a state Highway 371 signalized intersection from Hazelwood Drive to Main Street. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) as part of its Highway 371 North Improvement Project from Nisswa to Pine River in 2014 is relocating this

Nisswa: Nisswa Lake Park & Beach Acquisition & Dev.

signalized intersection further south away from Main Street. When this happens pedestrians will no longer be able to cross State Highway 371 from Hazelwood Drive to Main Street safely at this location. The pedestrian bridge will allow a safe crossing from the proposed Nisswa Lake Park and Beach to Downtown Nisswa and the Paul Bunyan State Trail.

Project Contact Person

Brian Lehman, Mayor City of Nisswa PO Box 262 Nisswa, Minnesota 56468 Phone: (218) 838-4158

Email: lehmanconsulting@nisswa.net

Governor's Recommendations

Nisswa: Nisswa Lake Park & Beach Acquisition & Dev.

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 60% of 2008 project costs are to be provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission in Minnesota. The state has existing grant programs to provide financial assistance in this area. This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is primarily of local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? The number of this type of local requests suggests that additional requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Nisswa City Council passed a resolution of support on June 20, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Predesign is not required for this project. |

North Mankato: Caswell Park Expansion

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$100,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (North Mankato)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of North Mankato, in Blue Earth County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$100,000 in state funding, which will cover 50 percent of the cost to acquire four acres of land for the purposes of expanding Caswell Park in the city of North Mankato.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$100,000 in state funding to acquire four acres of land for the purposes of expanding Caswell Park in the city of North Mankato.

Caswell Park is one of the premier softball complexes in the state of Minnesota. The park was originally built on 25 acres in 1985 having four premier lighted softball fields. Based on the demand for high-quality playing fields, two additional playing fields were added in 2002. In 2005, the North Mankato city council authorized the purchase of 12 acres of land located immediately west of the park for expansion. In the summer of 2007, construction of a Miracle League field will begin on a portion of this land. The Miracle League field will be specifically designed to provide disabled children the opportunity to play baseball or softball regardless of their disabilities on a custom designed cushioned synthetic turf.

Since 1994, Caswell Park has annually hosted the Minnesota State Girls' Fastpitch Tournament and regional softball tournaments. In 2005, Caswell Park hosted a 100-team National Men's Fastpitch Tournament. Based on the success of this National Tournament, Caswell Park will again host this event

in 2008. Additionally, Caswell Park will host a National Men's Senior Softball Tournament in 2007.

As Caswell Park has proven to be a successful complex under the direction and funding by the city of North Mankato, the city is proposing to purchase adjacent land to expand the park and provide additional recreational opportunities. Not only has Caswell Park proven to have local, regional and statewide significance, it also has proven to have national significance through hosting national softball tournaments.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this Caswell Park project is \$200,000. The city of North Mankato will be financially responsible for 50 percent of the project cost.

Other Considerations

The city of North Mankato owns and operates Caswell Park. The city would continue to own and operate any future expansions of the park.

Project Contact Person

Wendell Sande
City Administrator
1001 Belgrade Avenue
North Mankato, Minnesota 56003

Phone: (507) 625-4141 Fax: (507) 625-4151

Email: wsande@northmankato.com

Governor's Recommendations

North Mankato: Caswell Park Expansion

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| ١. | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| ۷. | Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission in | |
| | Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local | |
| | | |
| 3. | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| ٥. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| 4 | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| _ | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| _ | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the North Mankato City Council adopted a resolution of support | |
| | on June 4, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for this project. | |

Northfield: Public Safety & Regional Emergency Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$5,040,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Northfield)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Northfield, in Rice County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$5.04 million in state funding to acquire the land, finance the design, construction and furnishing of a new public safety and regional emergency operations center in Northfield, Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$5.04 million in state funding to acquire the land, finance the design, construction and furnishing of a new public safety and regional emergency operations center in Northfield, Minnesota. The city's current facility is over 36 years old and cannot accommodate the personnel and equipment required for the current level of operations. The current facility is located on the banks of the Cannon River and is subject to flooding. The current site cannot be used to expand the current facility. The current site is at the intersection of two state highways and a railroad crossing and greatly restricts emergency access. Alternative sites are being studied.

Northfield has regional significance:

- ◆ The city of Northfield currently serves as the coordinating agency for the South Central Drug Investigation Unit.
- ◆ The city of Northfield serves as the booking and breath testing site for Dakota and Rice Counties, the cities of Lonsdale and Dundas and the Minnesota State Patrol.
- Northfield serves as the back-up dispatch center for the Rice/Steele counties.

- Northfield serves as the back-up emergency operations center for Rice County.
- Northfield is the host site for the Marine/Army Radio System which serves three states.
- Northfield has been designated as a three-county inoculation site by the Minnesota Department of Health.
- Northfield's present safety center houses the equipment for the Northfield Area Rural Fire Service (which serves six communities and four townships in two different counties).
- ♦ The city of Northfield has been in communication with the local National Guard unit regarding a possible partnership in providing additional storage facilities.
- ◆ The city of Northfield is home to two nationally ranked private colleges: Carleton and St. Olaf. Approximately 38 percent of the city's total market value is tax exempt.
- ◆ There is a demonstrated need in the region for a public safety/ emergency management training center. Given Northfield's present involvement with other agencies in the region, any new facility constructed would be designed to provide suitable training facilities for the region.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost for this project is \$10 million (\$1.6 million of state funding will be requested in 2010). The remainder of the project costs, \$3.96 million, will be funded through general obligation bonds issued by the city of Northfield.

Other Considerations

The city of Northfield will own and operate the facility.

Project schedule:

June 2008 – Construction starts
September 2009 – Construction completed

Northfield: Public Safety & Regional Emergency Ctr

Project Contact Person

Al Roder, City Administrator City of Northfield 801 Washington Street Northfield, Minnesota 55037-2598

Phone: (507) 645-3070 Fax: (507) 645-3055

Email: Al.Roder@ci.northfield.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Northfield: Public Safety & Regional Emergency Ctr

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 40% of project total costs of \$10 million are to be provided from local |
| 2. | government funds. Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| ۷. | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local, but with some |
| 4. | regional, benefit. Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| '' | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | The degree to which the project competes with other facilities |
| | depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic |
| | service area. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Northfield City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| 9. | June 18, 2007. Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| ٥. | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | The city expected to submit a project predesign in Fall 2007. |

Northome: Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,975,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Northome)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Northome, in Koochiching County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$4.975 million in state funding to predesign, design, construct, and administer a sanitary sewer rehabilitation project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$4.975 million in state funding to predesign, design, construct, and administer a sanitary sewer rehabilitation project. The following work will also be completed as part of this project: water mains over 50 years old and under streets that will be tore up will also be replaced, maintenance to storm sewer catch basins, sanitary treatment pond and access road stabilization, restoration work, and replacement of corroded lift station control panels.

The city of Northome wastewater treatment system consists of a primary and secondary stabilization pond. These ponds were designed to treat 44,250 gallons per day (gpd). Normal flows during periods of low groundwater are in the range of 13,000 to 14,000 gpd. However, during sustained heavy rain events occurring during periods of high ground water, wastewater flows have been recorded as high as 140,000 gpd. This results in bypasses and overflows of untreated sewage into the environment. A recent study attributes these periods of high flow to excessive infiltration and inflow caused by sections of old and deteriorating sanitary infrastructure (i.e. sewer mains and manholes). The solution to this problem is to replace areas of old and leaky sewer main and manholes. The city is proposing a sanitary sewer rehabilitation project, which will also include limited water and storm sewer

replacement and restoration work within the same corridor. The proposed project will result in a significant decrease in infiltration and inflow – thereby reducing the incidents of sanitary sewer system overflows that historically occur during these events, as well as related public and environmental health concerns.

Northome is disadvantaged regarding its wellbeing indicator of income per capita, as defined by census bureau reports. Additionally, because Northome has a very low average net tax capacity, Northome is seeking a budget request greater than 50 percent of project costs.

This project has local, regional, and statewide significance in that: 1) it will directly reduce the incidents of sanitary sewer overflows within the city of Northome; 2) it will assist in ongoing efforts to improve the overall water quality in the region's natural watersheds – most notably the Big Fork River and Red Lake; and 3) it will allow for the future operation and expansion of public infrastructure system necessary to meet the economic vitality and growth of this area of the state of Minnesota – an area with historical statewide, national, and global economic significance.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$4.975 million. The city will be pursuing other grant moneys, which may include Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED)'s Small Cities, Redevelopment Grant Program and federal Economic Development Administration. The city is aware of no or low interest loans available through the Public Facilities Authority (PFA).

However; currently the city of Northome holds a low interest loan with Minnesota PFA. The original amount of the loan was \$241,826. Currently the city budgets approximately \$13,000 to \$15,000 per year to fund the debt, which is approximately 20 percent of its water/sewer annual operating budget. Effective 12-31-07 the city's loan balance will be \$209,000.

Other Considerations

The sanitary sewer, water and storm sewer infrastructure is, and will continue to be owned and operated by the city of Northome.

Northome: Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project

With the availability of funding, construction crews would arrive onsite August 2008 with construction completed by September of 2009.

Project Contact Person

Karin Elhard, City Clerk Treasurer PO BOX 65 Northome, Minnesota 56661

Phone: (218) 897-5762 Fax: (218) 897-4002

Email: northome@paulbunyan.net

Governor's Recommendations

Northome: Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation Project

| | Fundamental and Desirate |
|-----|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | The city is requesting 100% state funding. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Northome City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 13, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | , ,, |

City of Oak Park Heights: Reconstruct TH36 Frontage Rds

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,354,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of Oak Park Heights)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Oak Park Heights, in Washington County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1.35 million to reconstruct both the north and south frontage roads of state Trunk Highway 36, which are located in the city of Oak Park Heights and the city of Stillwater lying between Oakgreen/Greeley Avenue and Osgood Avenue.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1.35 million to reconstruct both the north and south frontage roads of state Trunk Highway 36, which are located in the city of Oak Park Heights and the city of Stillwater lying between Oakgreen/Greeley Avenue and Osgood Avenue. These roads are currently owned and maintained by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT).

The current roadways contain numerous potholes, crumbling asphalt and other drainage problems that are progressively worsening and will continue to deteriorate until such time as the roadways become impassible negatively effecting the economic viability of local businesses, the area tax-base, the safety of pedestrians and the motoring public. The current roadway conditions are dangerous; see enclosed photographs.

To date, Mn/DOT has indicated that these roadways are not scheduled for reconstruction until possibly 2024, and has additionally indicated that is it a not a significant priority to warrant the diversion of other funds. Accordingly, the city of Oak Park Heights is at this time seeking an alternative funding solution from the 2008 Capital Appropriation to be allocated Mn/DOT to

specifically undertake this Project. As these roads are owned by Mn/DOT, the city believes that a local match is not necessary.

This request estimates approximately 8,000 linear feet of full street reconstruction, averaging 27' wide, utilizing a pavement section of 4 1/2" bituminous on 8" Class 5 aggregate – a seven-ton road design.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$1.35 million. The proposed project is to improve state frontage roads. There is no proposed local cost sharing. Mn/DOT has indicated that there is not a present funding source for this reconstruction, thus the city is requesting the appropriation herein.

Other Considerations

Mn/DOT does and will continue to own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Eric Johnson, City Administrator City of Oak Park Heights PO Box 2007 Stillwater, Minnesota 55082

Phone: (651) 439-4439 Fax: (651) 439-0574

Email: eajohnson@cityofoakparkheights.com

Governor's Recommendations

City of Oak Park Heights: Reconstruct TH36 Frontage Rds

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Transportation and economic development is an important state |
| | mission. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and |
| | Mn/DOT are responsible for transportation planning and |
| | programming and prioritizing state funding for transportation projects. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | Trunk Highway projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Oak Park Heights City Council adopted a resolution of |
| 0 | support on May 22, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| 10. | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |
| | blidges, italis of patriways. |

Olivia: SW Storm Sewer Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$821,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of Olivia)

PROJECT LOCATION:

Project At A Glance

The city of Olivia is requesting state funding of \$821,000 for a storm sewer system for the southwest portion of the city.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This city of Olivia is requesting \$821,000 in state funding to acquire land, predesign, design and construction a storm sewer system for the southwest portion of Olivia.

The comprehensive approach to stormwater collection and disposition is a key component of Olivia's five-year, \$12.1 million Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP's First Phase (2008) consists of replacing ineffective pre-1940's storm sewer mains serving the BOLD School District campus and abutting residences. The work includes both replacing pipe along the west side of the school campus and placing new 36 inch pipe to accommodate runoff from school buildings, parking lots, and athletic fields. Streets adjacent to the school will be reconstructed to support the heavy school-related traffic. Phase I also includes installing four and five-foot diameter storm sewer crossings, in a cooperative project with the Minnesota Department of Transportation, under state Highway 71. In addition, land required for the stormwater pond will be purchased.

Capital assistance for the school-area storm sewer improvements would have a beneficial financial effect on the three cities and 127,640 acres of farm land comprising the BOLD School District. Project financing elements of

increased user fees and special assessments will have a negative financial impact on district taxpayers already burdened with high property tax rates. With limited levy authority, monies used to pay these new charges are taken away from needed building maintenance and education.

Phase II of the CIP will finish the stormwater collection system by installing over a mile of larger-diameter pipes and constructing the holding pond. Completion will alleviate periodic flooding experienced in the past in the school area and the adjacent neighborhoods. Required street restoration resulting from this major activity adds significant costs to this phase. The CIP also calls for the replacement of old and failing clay sanitary sewer mains, undersized and outdated water mains, and lead water service lines to households.

The overall storm sewer project will have a positive impact on water quality for the Minnesota River. The 15-acre holding pond will accommodate the runoff while capturing the flow of sediment and pollutants in the watershed. The pond will also capture farm land runoff and reduce water surges into the Renville County ditch system which flows into the Minnesota.

Olivia residents, based on current estimates and favorable consideration by the state, will still be paying over 80 percent of the \$12.1 million cost through:

- Special assessments estimated at over \$9,000 for a typical residential lot
- Increased property taxes resulting from a debt levy increase greater than 50%.
- Increases to the stormwater utility district charges and water/sewer user fees.

State assistance of \$2.28 million would, in turn, provide the opportunity for the city of Olivia to reduce the cost impact on city property owners while performing needed improvements that benefit the region and address state goals.

Total Project Cost:

The SW Storm Sewer Project has a total cost of \$1.642 million in 2008 and \$2.934 million in 2010. (These cost figures do not include \$7.5 million in other utility and road improvements that are being done in conjunction with

Olivia: SW Storm Sewer Project

the storm sewer project.) The city of Olivia anticipates requesting an additional \$1.46 million from the state in 2010.

The city of Olivia will provide \$2.28 million through general obligation financing. The \$7.5 million of associated improvements will also be financed and paid from special assessments, user fees and property taxes.

Other Considerations

The city of Olivia will own and operate the facility.

For the trenching across Highway 71 the work will begin in May of 2008 and completed by June of 2008. The storm sewer work around the School District will begin in June and be competed by the end of July. For the balance of the storm sewer improvements design will be completed in 2010 and construction done during the summer of 2011.

No escalation factor has been included in either the 2008 or 2011 projections.

Project Contact Person

Daniel Hoffman, City Administrator City of Olivia

Phone: (320) 523-2361 Fax: (320) 523-1416

Email: cityofolivia@olivia.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Olivia: SW Storm Sewer Project

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Olivia City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | September 17, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| 40 | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Olmsted County: Regional Public Safety Training Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,655,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Olmsted County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Olmsted County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$3.65 million in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a public safety training facility for the purpose of providing physical skills training and practice for public safety personnel from throughout southeastern Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3.65 million in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a public safety training facility for the purpose of providing physical skills training and practice for public safety personnel from throughout southeastern Minnesota. This project is to provide three training facilities components:

- A simulated fire multi-story building ("Burn Tower") in which gas or carbon-based fires can be burned repeatedly and multi-story rescue can be exercised.
- A driving range to practice advanced driving skills at real-life speeds.
- A weapons training facility that allows for live-fire exercises indoors and outdoors utilizing motor vehicles and other props.

This facility will be located on approximately forty acres of land. Currently two similar sites just south of Rochester are under consideration. Cost factors for the two sites are approximately equal.

Firefighters, emergency medical personnel, licensed peace officers and detention officers conduct emergency and life-saving duties under conditions

of extreme, life-threatening stress. Firefighters don heavy packs and breathing apparatus and must function in smoke-filled and zero visibility buildings. Emergency medical personnel must drive one-ton ambulance vehicles in the worst of weather and road conditions, provide accurate medical care under all manner of conditions and safely transport the injured. Peace officers must make use of deadly force decisions in split seconds under extreme life-threatening stress in all manner of weather and other environmental situations.

In order for these personnel to function safely and effectively, their physical skills must be so well practiced as to be instinctive. This level of practice requires frequent repetition. In years past firefighters burned old farmhouses, they practiced driving on empty parking lots and police practiced static shooting techniques on "point and shoot" firing ranges. These practices are no longer adequate for the treats our personnel encounter today. Availability of abandoned farmhouses is non-existent, parking lots are an unsafe and inadequate training environment and police require real-life simulation practice in order to be effective and safe.

At this time no such facilities exist within southeastern Minnesota. And, such facilities that exist elsewhere in the state are too far away, requiring too much travel time to be sufficiently accessible, to achieve the frequency of practice that is necessary. The southeastern Minnesota region has approximately 5,000 volunteer or full-time professional public safety personnel that could utilize such facilities. Olmsted County in particular has 361 firefighters, 315 emergency medical personnel and 202 licensed peace officers. This population density is simply too great to be served by traveling to the Minneapolis/St. Paul metro area or Camp Ripley. Rather, they require convenient and accessible facilities.

Total Project Cost

The total cost for this project is \$7.3 million. The county of Olmsted will contribute \$800,000 for land (if site selection is on land owned by the county of Olmsted) and \$2.8 million for other costs. The city of Rochester will contribute \$800,000 for land (if site selection is on land owned by city of Rochester).

Olmsted County: Regional Public Safety Training Ctr

Other Considerations

The county of Olmsted will form joint powers authority consisting of representation from communities and public safety agencies from throughout Olmsted County to own and operate the facility. The land will be provided and ownership retained by either the city of Rochester or Olmsted County. The facility will be designed and operated independently by the agency utilizing the facility; however, public safety personnel from those agencies participating on the joint powers authority will provide supervision and oversight.

The project schedule is outlined below:

Complete design June 2008
Begin construction September 2008
Complete construction June 2009

Project Contact Person

Steven C. Borchardt, Olmsted County Sheriff 101 4th Street S.E.

Rochester, Minnesota 55904 Phone: (507) 285-8306

Email: Borchardt.steve@co.olmsted.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Please see the governor's recommendation for the Department of Public Safety.

Olmsted County: Regional Public Safety Training Ctr

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding | |
| | sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission | |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local | |
| 3. | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| ٥. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| ٦. | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| 0. | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission | |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local | |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | The degree to which the project competes with other facilities | |
| | depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic | |
| 8. | service area. Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| 0. | Yes; the Olmsted County Board adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | June 12, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign was submitted to the Department of | |
| | Administration and was found to be sufficient. | |

Ortonville: Ortonville Regional Parks Improvments

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$129,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Ortonville)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Ortonville, in Big Stone County

Project At A Glance

This request for \$129,000 in state funding is to construct improvements for the municipal park system in the city of Ortonville.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request for \$129,000 in state funding is to construct improvements for the municipal park system in the city of Ortonville. This work will strengthen the already-established regional significance of these parks by providing better recreation opportunities, and bringing important park facilities into compliance for handicapped visitors.

Ortonville is on Big Stone Lake, a large 26-mile long, 12,610-acre lake on the border with South Dakota. The lake is the source of the Minnesota River and is a key reason why the parks are of regional significance. Big Stone Lake is a haven for sportsmen, hunters, outdoor enthusiasts, and tourists. The parks make possible world-class fishing tournaments, horse trail rides, historic boat tours, the annual Corn Fest, and more. Swimming, golfing, boating, fishing, cross-country skiing, and wildlife exploration all add to the parks' year-round regional importance.

Established in stages since 1890, the park system includes eight individual parks. One of the core parks (Lakeside) is proposed for assistance in this request. Proximity to the lake and its amenities, coupled with a location along the Yellowstone Trail and a long tradition of excellent public recreation, have established the parks' regional significance. Each year thousands of visitors

from surrounding communities, counties, and South Dakota use these facilities.

Lakeside Park Improvements:

- Restroom and Concessions Building. The primary restroom is old, too small, not within the park boundaries, and not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant for disabled visitors. A new structure will be built which will be ADA compliant and located within the Park proper for better use by park patrons. This new building will also include a separate area for concessions and/or an information kiosk for residents and tourists alike.
- Playground. Currently the playground equipment is located near an area of the park that is adjacent to a road. In order to provide safety separation between the playground area and the road, the playground will be relocated to a different end of the park. This will provide better separation for traffic, plus a larger "clear space" area in the center of the park where crowds congregate for public events at a classic old gazebo. A small parking area will be provided to allow parents to park near where their children are playing.
- Walkway. The only existing means of traversing the park from the north end to the south is an existing street. In order to separate the pedestrian traffic from vehicle traffic, the city will construct a sidewalk along the westerly (lake) side of the park. This sidewalk will connect the playground area noted above to the south end of the park.

Total Project Cost

The total cost for this project is \$258,000. The city of Ortonville will provide the required 50 percent match of the total project cost through the city's park and recreation budget.

Other Considerations

The facilities will continue to be owned and operated by the city of Ortonville.

The project schedule is outlined below:

June 2008 – Crews arrive on site and construction commences.

October 2008 – Completion of all work with certificate of occupancy.

Ortonville: Ortonville Regional Parks Improvments

A cost escalation factor has not been used because all work can be bid, contracted, and completed within one construction season. The above schedule is based on the assumption that funds would be available in May of 2008.

Project Contact Person

David Lang, Clerk-Administrator 315 Madison Avenue Ortonville, Minnesota 56278

Phone: (320) 839-3428 Fax: (320) 839-2319

Email: clerkadministrator@cityofortonville.org

Governor's Recommendations

Ortonville: Ortonville Regional Parks Improvments

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| _ | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of the costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing recreational opportunitites is an important state mission in |
| | Minnesota. The state has existing grant programs to provide |
| | finanical assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding funding for |
| | similar projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Ortonville City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 18, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |

Osseo ISD # 279: Northwest Henn Family Svc Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Osseo ISD # 279)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Brooklyn Center, in Hennepin County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$3.5 million in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish, and equip Phase 2 of the Northwest Hennepin Regional Family Services Center (FSC) to be located in Hennepin County, city of Brooklyn Center.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3.5 million in state funding to acquire land, design, construct, furnish, and equip Phase 2 of the Northwest Hennepin Regional Family Services Center (FSC) to be located in Hennepin County, city of Brooklyn Center.

State funds will be combined with non-state funds to complete the project budget for Phase 2. State funding represents 22 percent of the Phase 2 project budget. Phase 1 of this project opened in January 2006 to provide adult continuing education services to the region. ISD #279 provided 100 percent of the project budget for Phase 1.

State funds will provide for Phase 2 facility costs related to shared and joint use by the school district and its private non-profit and county services partners. Without this state funding, the project partners will be unable to complete construction of a facility capable of meeting the unique and extensive community needs addressed by this regional collaborative.

State funds will serve as the 'glue' that binds together the efforts of the independent agencies and organizations working to create a collaborative, local response to a growing community challenge that exceeds the capacity of any individual organization. The amount of funding requested from the state for this significant community investment is the equivalent cost of serving approximately 100 families in the Minnesota Family Investment Plan (MFIP).

This regional center is a collaborative of public and private organizations pooling resources and coordinating service delivery to increase their capacity to provide services to an increasing concentration of at-risk Minnesota families living in this region.

The primary goal of this project is to ensure that students in the region are ready to learn when they attend school. The FSC will be an 89,000 sq. ft. facility built in two phases. Phase 2 represents completion of a master plan designed to help at-risk learners improve their academic outcomes by providing access to services that meet needs for food, clothing, shelter, health care, English language and job skills programs, housing assistance, parent support services, and other basic human services and public assistance programs. Too often our students are not ready to learn in the classroom because these basic needs are unmet. The building is part of a campus that already includes an early childhood and family education center.

This region of the state has the highest incidence of single parent households and teen pregnancy. Truancy and student mobility are at record levels. The region represents only 20 percent of the suburban population base, yet accounts for more than 43 percent of suburban participants in the state MFIP program. Nearly half of all students (49 percent) in Brooklyn Center participate in free/reduced school meal programs. In Hennepin County, 62 percent of families who speak Laotian at home (as well as 88 percent who speak Hmong and 47 percent who speak an African language) live in this region. Children who are coming to school unprepared to learn are overwhelming local schools and diverting educational resources from teaching.

The FSC is the product of four years of planning by the partners, lead by the Northwest Hennepin County Family Services Collaborative, a regional planning agent created by the State Legislature in 1993.

Osseo ISD # 279: Northwest Henn Family Svc Ctr

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$15.982 million. Non-state funds to be contributed are outlined below (in thousands of dollars):

| | Phase 1 | Phase 2 |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| School District #279 | \$4,038.3 | -0- |
| Hennepin County (MHP) | -0- | \$100.0 |
| Primary Care Health Services Provider | -0- | \$8,142.0 |
| Federal (HUD-EDI): | -0- | \$250.0 |
| Private: | | |
| Tenant agency funds | -0- | \$600.0 |
| Private gifts and grants | \$938.6 | \$3,389.7 |
| Non-state subtotal | \$4,976.9 | \$12,481.7 |

Previous Appropriations for this Project

Planning funds for this project were awarded as a grant from the Department of Education in October 2005.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by Independent School District #279. The facility will be jointly operated by ISD #279 in partnership with the other facility tenants.

Project schedule:

- a. Project development and financing January 2004 to present
- b. Design development and construction documents
 - i. Phase I: 9/1/04-12/31/04 ii. Phase II: 1/08 – 4/08
- c. Construction start-date
 - i. Phase I: 4/28/05 ii. Phase II: 10/08
- d. Construction Completion/Occupancy

i. Phase I: 11/15/05 ii. Phase II: 10/09

Project Contact Person

Susan Hintz, Superintendent 11200-93rd Avenue North Maple Grove, Minnesota 55369

Phone: (763) 391-7003 Fax: (763) 391-7071

Email: hintzs@district279.org

Governor's Recommendations

Osseo ISD # 279: Northwest Henn Family Svc Ctr

| | Final vertices of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 79% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding |
| | sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the ISD 279 School Board submitted minutes from their meeting |
| | of September 20, 2005 indicating support for the project and their |
| | intention to seek out state funding for a portion of the project. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Yes, a predesign was submitted in September 2007. |
| | |

Palisade: Annexation Infrastructure for Wastewater Sys

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$830,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Palisade)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Palisade, in Aitkin County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$830,000 in state funding to add three areas of the community into the water and wastewater system.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$830,000 in state funding to add three areas of the community into the water and wastewater system, specifically the properties that border the Mississippi River that do not have the land base to house individual mound systems. This request includes infrastructure to the Industrial Park to provide economic growth potential and fire protection.

This project will protect the Mississippi River from failing individual sewer systems currently in place, provide safer drinking water and will allow better fire protection for those residents that will be connected in this infrastructure project.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$830,000. There are no other funds available locally for this project.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The Minnesota Public Facilities Authority (PFA) is the state agency that is working with the city of Palisade on the current Corrective Action Project for their wastewater system which was included in the 2006 Bonding Bill.

Other Considerations

City of Palisade will own and operate the wastewater system. The project is expected to start and finish in the fall of 2008.

Project Contact Person

Eric Howe, Mayor PO Box 91 Palisade, Minnesota 56469

Fax: (218) 845-0028

Email: beartoothlogs@yahoo.com

Governor's Recommendations

Palisade: Annexation Infrastructure for Wastewater Sys

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| ١٠. | The city is requesting 100% state funding. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| ۷. | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| 3. | |
| ა. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| _ | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| _ | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Palisade City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | July 2, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Paynesville: Washburne Ave Improvement Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$925,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Paynesville)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Paynesville, in Stearns County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$925,000 in state funding to acquire land, design and construct a portion of Washburne Avenue to provide a safe route between the new TH 23 location and the downtown area in the city of Paynesville, Stearns County, Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$925,000 in state funding to acquire land, design and construct a portion of Washburne Avenue to provide a safe route between the new TH 23 location and the downtown area in the city of Paynesville, Stearns County, Minnesota. The Paynesville TH 23 Bypass Project is currently in the design phase and the construction of the project is planned for 2009 and 2010. With the design of this project underway, the city of Paynesville is actively exploring what improvements are going to be necessary as a result of the TH 23 relocation. One of the main projects that is being considered is the realignment and reconstruction of a portion of Washburne Avenue to create a new link between the new highway and the downtown and industrial area of Paynesville.

In order for motorists along the new TH 23 route to access the downtown and industrial park area of Paynesville, they would utilize Lake Avenue. Lake Avenue is a rural section roadway that is built to a typical township road standard. In addition, Lake Avenue and the main street through the downtown area, Washburne Avenue, do not line up, so motorists will be expected to maneuver an awkward intersection. Also, Minnie Street is the

main roadway to the city's industrial park and will see considerable traffic once the new highway is constructed. The attached "Existing Conditions" figure illustrates the area of concern.

To create a new safe corridor into Paynesville, the city is considering reconfiguring the intersection of Washburne Avenue/Lake Avenue/Minnie Street and extending the "new" Washburne Avenue along the existing Lake Avenue corridor to the new TH 23 location. The attached "Proposed Alignment" figure illustrates the proposed route. As shown on the figure, the improvements would remove the unconventional intersection and create a new corridor that is properly designed.

The Paynesville TH 23 Bypass Project is definitely a project that has significant regional and statewide impacts. The Department of Transportation (MnDOT) is investing a lot of money to complete the bypass project to insure that motorists have a safe route to travel at an adequate speed. However, the bypass project creates problems like the one identified above that the city of Paynesville has to address. The city wants to make sure that they have the proper infrastructure facilities in place to counteract the changes that will result from the new TH 23 location. The city wants to be proactive in addressing the issues rather than reacting to the problem in the future after the bypass project is complete.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$1.825 million. The remaining \$900,000 will be paid by the city of Paynesville.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned and operated by the city of Paynesville.

The project is expected to begin by May 2008 and take approximately 12-months to complete.

Paynesville: Washburne Ave Improvement Project

Project Contact Person

Chuck DeWolf Bolton & Menk, Inc. Phone: (320) 231-3956

Governor's Recommendations

Paynesville: Washburne Ave Improvement Project

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| ١. | 49% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| ۷. | Transportation is an important state mission. However, the extent to |
| | which local transportation corridors are a state versus local funding |
| | responsibility is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| ٥. | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| ۲. | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| ٥. | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| 0. | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | The mayor of Paynesville submitted a letter indicating the city's |
| | support for the project and reporting that the City Council |
| | unanimously passed a resolution to authorize the application. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Pemberton: Pemberton Community Center

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$200,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Pemberton)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Pemberton, in Blue Earth County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$200,000 in state funds to provide for needed equipment for internal use in the newly renovated Pemberton Community Center to be located in the city of Pemberton.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$200,000 in state funds to provide for needed equipment for internal use in the newly renovated Pemberton Community Center to be located in the city of Pemberton. Approximately 10 years ago the Pemberton Elementary School was abandoned by the Janesville/Waldorf/Pemberton School District. The city of Pemberton subsequently acquired the building and has attempted to define a reuse of the building. Several alternatives included: renovation of the old two-story building for subsidized housing; development of an economic development 'incubator' building; and renovation of the newer building area as a community center. The city has been successful in securing commitments from local businesses to occupy limited areas of the structure and the city is prepared to develop the balance of the facility into an overall community center with meeting rooms, activity areas, and meeting space. The 'business' tenants would include: a child daycare center, the new post office, and an insurance office, in addition the city would occupy space for the city clerk, council chambers, and majority of the facility would be dedicated to community events and gatherings. In order to prepare for the renovation of the building, the city has undertaken the removal of hazardous materials (asbestos), demolition of structurally

unsound areas, rerouting of utilities from the old building area, and preparation of architectural concepts and cost estimates.

The city has invested approximately \$95,000 in the above activities and is prepared to proceed with the issuance of approximately \$855,000 in local bonds to facilitate the building renovation. However, that city is still in need of approximately \$200,000 for internal equipment (chairs, tables, kitchen equipment, play equipment, etc) to make the facility fully usable. Other local resources have been sought but are insufficient to cover these equipment needs.

This project has local significance to the Pemberton and surrounding residents since there are no comparable facilities in the area and communities like St. Clair, and Waldorf.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost for this project is \$1.03 million. Pemberton will issue Bonds for all construction, bonding and site preparation work in June 2007 for \$833,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Pemberton will own and operate the community center.

Project Schedule:

August 2007 Initiate Construction

June 2008 Construction Completion

August 2008 Equipment Installation start

October 2008 Equipment fully Installed

Project Contact Person

Doug Baer, Council Member (Project Coordinator) City of Pemberton PO Box 36 Pemberton, Minnesota 56078-0036

Phone: (507) 869-3650 Cell: (507) 381-1678 Grants to Political Subdivisions

Project Narrative

Pemberton: Pemberton Community Center

Governor's Recommendations

Pemberton: Pemberton Community Center

| Evaluation of Legal Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 80% local funds will match 20% state funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state role in funding community center style projects is unclear | |
| | and has varied considerably from one biennium to another. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if | |
| | the state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Pemberton City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | June 26, 2007 | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the | |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. | |
| | | |

Pierz: TH 25 / Main Street Reconstruction

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Pierz)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Pierz, in Morrison County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1 million in state funding to re-construct state Highway 25/Main Street in the city of Pierz, county of Morrison.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1 million in state funding to re-construct state Highway 25/Main Street in the city of Pierz, county of Morrison. This re-construction includes water main and service line replacement, storm sewer replacement, street lighting replacement, sidewalk replacement, curb and gutter replacement, and road surfacing. Pierz is projected to be in the financial position to dedicate funds to this project, which will be administered by Minnesota Department of Transportation's (Mn/DOT) District 3A when construction begins in 2009. In order to provide a clear depiction of Pierz's financial capacity, our median annual income is \$28,000. Expenses such as water and sewer bills are high for residents (minimum of \$70.00 per customer, per month). With the city council being aware of Pierz's modest nature and high rates, our 2007 net levy was \$280,515.

Mn/DOT initially scheduled Pierz for a mill-and-overlay job in 2011 or beyond, and notified the city in 2006 with a mailed letter. After several meetings between the city council and the Rich Prairie Sewer and Water District Board, a consensus was reached that infrastructure replacement on Main Street could not wait much longer. A comprehensive re-construction project needed to take place so as to avoid extensive road closures, utility service interruption, etc. Influencing the decision to move quickly be a

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) letter dated 11-13-06 notifying Pierz that after conducting research, 53 percent of the water pumped through the city system is unaccounted for; there is a major undetected leak. Since the American Water Works Association recommends that no more than 10 percent of all water pumped through a city system should go unaccounted for, the city knew that it was in trouble and had to seek help. Unnecessarily pumping an extra 47.7 million gallons of water per year like Pierz did in 2005 will cause a treatment and pump system to age very rapidly. Rich Prairie believes that a major reason for this problem is water escaping out of the 70-year-old water main underneath Main Street.

Additionally, Mn/DOT has conducted so many re-surfacing or "mill-and-overlay" jobs on Main Street that the middle of the road has developed a dramatic crown due to layers and layers of bituminous surface. Mn/DOT has always deemed it sufficient to add on another layer of bituminous surface when TH 25 appeared a bit rough, and as a result the city is now left with both drainage and curb and gutter deterioration issues. If the suggested 2011 "mill-and-overlay" were to be conducted, it would only prove detrimental to local infrastructure. Pierz felt that the time has come for re-construction and concurrent Main Street revitalization in order for the area to survive.

The city council began to invite representatives of Mn/DOT to Pierz to discuss this issue in detail. Talks progressed, and Mn/DOT agreed to move the project up to 2009 and administer a total Highway 25/Main Street reconstruction through the city as detailed above. The city is participating in cost-sharing efforts with Mn/DOT on all phases of the re-construction except the water works replacement, which is solely a local project. The TH 25/Main Street re-construction project has both local and regional significance as Highway 25 serves as the central business district and the major thoroughfare for this city; TH 25 is also a commonly used state highway with an elevated traffic volume.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project will be \$2.5 million. The city of Pierz and Water/Sewer Utility District will contribute \$1 million.

Pierz: TH 25 / Main Street Reconstruction

Other Considerations

All water works are owned and maintained by Rich Prairie Sewer and Water, an entity serving three very small cities in close proximity of each other. Sidewalk, street, (with the exception of TH 25) curb and gutter, street lighting, and storm sewer are owned and maintained by the city.

Construction crews are to first arrive on site in April of 2009, and phased construction is tentatively scheduled to occur throughout the summer, with completion scheduled to be before fall 2009.

Project Contact Person

Michael DeRosia, City Administrator 101 Main Street South, Box 367 Pierz, Minnesota 56364.

Phone: (320) 468-6471 Fax: (320) 468-2759 Email: Pierz@mywdo.com

Governor's Recommendations

Pierz: TH 25 / Main Street Reconstruction

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 60% of the \$2.5 million project costs are to be provided from non- state funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Transportation is an important state mission. For the Trunk Highway system, Mn/DOT is responsible for transportation planning and programming and prioritizing state funding for transportation projects. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar Trunk Highway projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes, the Pierz City council adopted a resolution of support on June 25, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways. | |

Pine Island: Elk Run Public Infrastructure development

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$4,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Pine Island)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Pine Island, Goodhue and Olmsted counties

Project At A Glance

The request is for \$4 million in state funding to plan, design and build public infrastructure which includes sanitary sewer, water mains, lift stations and other related utilities to spur economic development and growth in the city of Pine Island and in both Goodhue and Olmsted counties.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The request is for \$4 million in state funding to plan, design and build public infrastructure which includes sanitary sewer, water mains, lift stations and other related utilities to spur economic development and growth in the city of Pine Island and in both Goodhue and Olmsted counties.

The state's funding of infrastructure has local, regional and statewide significance.

Tower Investments, a private real estate development firm has committed \$48 million for the purchase of 2,328 acres of property in Pine Island to develop a large mixed-use development project called Elk Run which includes the largest bioscience development in the state of Minnesota in the heart of Life Science Alley. Elk Run has the potential to create 7,288 BioBusiness jobs in the next eight years. The entire Elk Run project will create 28,457 jobs within the next 18 years.

A grant for infrastructure from the state shows:

- ♦ A commitment to develop the Life Science Alley Corridor which augments statewide efforts by the Department of Economic and Employment Development (DEED) and the BioBusiness Alliance to attract bioscience to Minnesota; and
- It will maximize the investment of Minnesota Department of Transportation's funding on the planned Highway 52 interchange in the heart of the Elk Run development. Elk Run will be a location where convergence occurs and where developing synergies between two or more distinct disciplines creates new opportunities. Elk Run will create an area of critical mass and the importance of focusing its funds to have the greatest impact.

Elk Run's close proximity to Mayo Clinic, University of Minnesota and IBM makes it a natural location to take advantage of market demand. Elk Run with its inclusion of The Falls-a healthy living campus and an elk preserve makes for a unique community that will differentiate our region and further promote Minnesota to the Nation and the World as a leader in the bioscience field to attract new and existing bioscience companies.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost for this project is \$14.9 million. The city of Pine Island will be contributing \$2 million and tower investments, a private developer, will be providing \$8.9 million.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This is not a subsequent phase. However, the city of Pine Island received an amount of \$100,000 for the study of infrastructure costs related to development and economic growth in the 2007 session. HF No. 1775.

Other Considerations

City of Pine Island will own any and all infrastructure. The city of Pine Island Public Works Department will operate the facility.

Pine Island: Elk Run Public Infrastructure development

Assuming funding is approved in May of 2008, construction crews will arrive 6-1-08. A certificate of occupancy will be issued 6-1-09.

Project Contact Person

City of Pine Island Abraham Algadi PO Box 1000 Pine Island, Minnesota 55963

Phone: (507) 356-4591 Fax: (507) 356-8230 Email: pica@pitel.net

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Pine Island: Elk Run Public Infrastructure development

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 73% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Pine Island City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | Auguest 21, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |
| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

Pope county: West Central Treatment & Correctional Ctr

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$12,108,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Pope County with WCTCC

Consortium)

PROJECT LOCATION: Otter Tail County, City of Fergus Falls

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$12.1 million in state funding to complete detailed operational programming/predesign, design, construct, and equip a new 60 bed chemical dependency and mental health treatment facility.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$12.1 million in state funding to complete detailed operational programming/predesign, design, construct, and equip a new 60 bed chemical dependency and mental health treatment facility capable of serving the chemically dependent and mentally ill population within the region which demand treatment within a detention level security environment. The facility is anticipated to be located in the city of Fergus Falls, Otter Tail County, Minnesota.

Regional Impact:

Chemical dependency treatment needs continue to increase throughout the state of Minnesota while the region and state have focused significant efforts in providing chemical dependency treatment to their resident populations, and this treatment effort has and continues to show effectiveness in serving the ever growing need within the region, however, "pre-trial" and "post-trial" inmates incarcerated in detention facilities throughout the state represent a population which has been difficult to treat effectively and often are not reached by treatment at all. Though each county continues to place treatment in a high priority, availability of treatment staff (often unavailable to

smaller counties), the difficulty of providing treatment within an operational county jail well trained for detention needs but inexperienced in chemical dependency treatment, and the challenges of providing effective treatment to only one or two individuals at a time all combine to create the challenges of effective chemical dependency treatment within any county detention environment.

Through the establishment of chemical dependency and mental health treatment program, this facility will work synergistically with existing non-detention secure and nonsecure treatment services and will serve a currently unmet need for the entire West Central Region and includes 11 partner counties: Becker, Clay, Douglas, Grant, Otter Tail, Pope, Stevens, Todd, Traverse, Wadena, and Wilkin.

Facility Need:

The Office of the Legislative Auditor (OLA) evaluated chemical dependency treatment programs in 2006 and refers to assessments completed by the Department of Corrections (DOC) on 4,000 inmates in 2004 that determined 64 percent of the prisoners were "chemically dependent" and another 25 percent were "chemically abusive." In addition, the OLA reports on "Prevalence and Co-occurrence of Substance Use Disorders and Independent Mood Anxiety Disorders: Results From the National Epidemiology Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions," published in 2004. The study states 60 percent of the people with drug use disorders and 41 percent of the alcoholics seeking treatment in the previous 12 months had at least one mood disorder. The OLA surveyed community-based corrections directors and found that 96 percent favored stronger emphasis by substance abuse treatment programs "on addressing clients' mental health needs."

Based on the state-wide calculations by the OLA, 11 county region anticipates a total potential current need of an average daily population of 157 chemically dependent inmates. Specific facility population history assessments and current population surveys including a region wide assessment of all inmates present on 5-30-07 clearly illustrate a likely chemical dependent inmate population of a total of 157, with a total of 76 were inmates residing within the 11 county region and receiving no or limited chemical dependency treatment while incarcerated.

Pope county: West Central Treatment & Correctional Ctr

By pooling resources and operational capacities, the 11 county region will be capable of providing high quality chemical dependency and mental health treatment to this underserved population, resulting in reduced recidivism rates of these highest of repeat offender individuals.

Facility Operational Vision

The West Central CD Treatment Center would be designed to accept the full range of chemical dependent and mentally ill inmates from alcohol to methamphtimines, and from minimum security to super-maximum security classifications. Inmates may be post-judicated and sentenced to this facility and its treatment program, or they may be pre-trial inmates housed within the facility and exposed to group treatment or chemical dependency sensitive programming. Treatment professionals may provide treatment staffing currently operating in near-by non-detention treatment facilities and represent a compatible rather then overlapping service. Transportation to and from local holding facilities and courts for all inmate populations will be provided by facility transportation staff and would be coordinated with local court calendars. Treatment operations will account for extending treatment follow-up into local communities, as individuals are re-integrated into their communities.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost for this project is \$13.4 million. Local funding has yet to be finalized. Preliminary local contribution anticipated at a total of \$1.35 million.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned and operated by/on behalf of a local governmental agency. Exact ownership structure is currently being finalized, but is likely to be Otter Tail County or the Multi-County WCTCC consortium on behalf of all 11 participating counties.

Preliminary project schedule anticipates construction start on or about 4-1-09 and Substantial Completion on or about 11-1-10.

Project Contact Person

Riaz Aziz County Administration Pope County 130 E. Minnesota Avenue Glenwood, Minnesota 56334 Phone: (320) 634-5029

Email: riaz.aziz@co.pope.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Pope county: West Central Treatment & Correctional Ctr

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Local funding is not finalized. preliminary local contributions totalling \$1.35 million, or about 10% of total costs, are anticipated. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? The state role in funding chemical dependency and mental health treatment beds for regional detention facility projects is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project has primarily regional significance. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Unclear. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes. The County Boards of the following eleven counties have adopted resolutions of support for the project: Becker, Clay, Douglas, Grant, Otter Tail, Pope, Stevens, Todd, Traverse, Wadena and Wilkin. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A project predesign will be submitted prior to the 2008 legislative session. |

Princeton: Joint Public Safety Building

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Princeton)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Princeton, Mille Lacs & Sherburne counties

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$3 million in state funding to construct a new public safety building to be the headquarters for police, fire, and emergency operations center and to store equipment for Monticello Nuclear accident relocation to be located in the city of Princeton, Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3 million in state funding to construct a new public safety building to be the headquarters for police, fire, and emergency operations center and to store equipment for Monticello Nuclear accident relocation to be located in the city of Princeton, Minnesota. This project has local, regional and statewide significance because of the following reasons:

Local Significance: Princeton police and fire stations are busting at the seams for space because of the added responsibilities of a growing service area and providing emergency relocation services for the Monticello nuclear power plant. The closest police departments are 14+ miles from Princeton. Accordingly, the Princeton Police Department is often called out for high priority police calls within a 345 square mile area. Both the fire and police departments have been making the best possible use of the facilities they have for years. Space limitations make additional modifications to existing buildings unreasonable and costly.

Princeton straddles Sherburne and Mille Lacs counties at the intersection of Highways 169 and 95. This area has seen explosive population growth in the

last several years. However, Mille Lacs County is experiencing very little commercial/industrial growth and the Sherco Coal Plant will be dropping from Sherburne County's tax roles. This is putting a heavy strain on residential tax rates for both counties. Economic development is a strong priority for us to help remedy this disparity but it will take time.

The Princeton school district is overpopulated by 500 elementary school students and has been unable to pass a referendum to build a new elementary school. We are working on a plan with the school to reduce costs and address concerns voiced by voters to come up with a plan the voters will accept. It would be advantageous if the public safety building/EOC did not have to compete with the school district for property tax dollars. Additionally, the city of Princeton has many other significant public infrastructure projects that have strapped local financial resources, for example a \$19 million wastewater treatment facility, which would have been only \$13 million if not for circumstances beyond Princeton's control (MPCA lawsuit).

Regional Significance: Although the Fire Department is a local entity, its service area is growing. Station is approximately 40 years old but the department's responsibilities and training are much greater and trucks and equipment have dramatically increased in size in recent years. We choose to have two tankers because the nearest additional tanker is 12 miles away. We provide fire coverage for all or parts of five townships in the three counties surrounding Princeton. The fire department has to rent storage space for equipment and store additional equipment outside.

A new facility is needed not only to meet the city of Princeton's public safety needs, but also the needs of the region as we are a major emergency operations center for two distinctly different disaster plans; Monticello Nuclear Power Plant and flu outbreak. The nuclear power plant disaster plan calls for vehicle and people contamination. In order to be efficient with these activities, we will need three drive-through bays that can each handle three cars at a time, allowing us to decontaminate nine vehicles at once. Another point of regional significance is that our fire department works closely with what is now the busiest air care helicopter in the four-state area, North Air Ambulance. It's busier than HCMC.

A new facility is needed in order to grant requests for training. Because of its central location, Princeton is frequently requested to host training events for

Princeton: Joint Public Safety Building

local, county, and state agencies but has no space available. The training is critical for EOC's and relocation center activities. There are no other suitable facilities in the area.

State significance: State patrol dedicates several patrolmen to our area but has no processing area/office space for many miles—they are currently using a very small space in the Mille Lacs County Sheriff's office that does not fully meet their needs. These officers also use facilities in Princeton as well because of the location and the good relationship the departments share, but ours is not well suited either. We would love to more fully accommodate them.

Total Project Cost:

The total cost of this project is \$6 million. Federal funding has been requested in the amount of \$3 million.

Other Considerations

The city of Princeton will own, operate and fully maintain the public safety building.

Project Schedule:

Site Acquisition August 2007

Design September - December 2007

Start Construction May 2008 End Construction May 2009

Project Contact Person

Mark Karnowski, City Administrator City of Princeton 705 2nd Street North Princeton, Minnesota 55371

Phone: (763) 389-2040 Fax: (763) 389-0993

Email: mark@princetonmn.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Princeton: Joint Public Safety Building

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of 2008 project costs are anticipated to be provided from non- |
| | state funding (federal) sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing public safety facilities is an important state mission in |
| | Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit, but this |
| | facility could assist with regional or some statewide roles with respect to the Monticello Nuclear Power Plant. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| 7. | projects. |
| /. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Yes; the Princeton City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | May 10, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is expected to be submitted in December 2007. |

Proctor: Kirkus St. Sanitary Sewer & Drinking Water

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,499,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Proctor)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Proctor, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1.5 million for extensions of sanitary sewer and drinking water systems (mains) under a new Kirkus Street road and bridge over CN railroad tracks.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1.5 million for extensions of sanitary sewer and drinking water systems (mains) under a new Kirkus Street road and bridge over CN railroad tracks.

The project will also consist of the construction of approximately one mile of roadway along new alignment within the city of Proctor, establishing a critical east/west connector. Also included will be a new bridge structure crossing of the CN/DM&IR Railway tracks, which bisect the city.

The project has regional significance due to the fact that it will serve as a major urban collector connecting Boundary Avenue (CSAH 14) and Ugstad Road (CSAH 11). This will result in a reduction in traffic at the TH 2 and atgrade railway crossings on 2nd Street (CSAH 11), a minor arterial. The new route will also provide decreased travel distance by nearly two miles over the only other grade separated railroad crossing, which lies at the far south edge of the city. Plus, it will resolve an extreme public safety concern by providing a second entrance/exit to the Proctor Regional Recreational Center, home of ISD #704's football, baseball and soccer fields.

Sidewalk is to be provided along one side of the roadway, as well as on the bridge. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has also expressed interest in funding a widening of the bridge structure to include a trail crossing. Water and sanitary sewer mains would also be extended with construction of the roadway.

This project is in the Duluth/Superior MIC 2025 and 2030 Long Range Transportation Plans as safety and flow transportation, connection improvements.

This project is highest priority in Proctor's 1997 and 2002 Comprehensive Plans and has been publicly discussed numerous times without opposition.

The Western Lake Superior Sanitary District (WLSSD) treats the Proctor wastewater. Individual Sewage Treatment Systems (ISTS) are not practical in this area due to steep slopes and high water tables.

A decision has been made to construct this wastewater collection system while the roadway project is being done vs. waiting until development requires partial extensions. Many duplicate costs and impacts will occur with separate construction of utilities. An economic analysis can be made on the timing of the improvements, but a price cannot be put on repeated risks of environmental disturbance and other inconveniences.

Constructing water mains along the Kirkus Street corridor will greatly improve the flows and reliability of the city water system. It would create a loop by connecting the trunk line in the center of the corridor to the 2/3 mile long dead-end water main on Almac Drive. Connecting the six-inch (to be replaced with a ten-inch diameter main) water main near Boundary Avenue to the trunk line in the center of the corridor will reduce the two-mile long loop into two one-mile long loops.

Loops are required to increase system capacity, reduce chances of extended periods of no water service, plus result in increasing water quality and elimination of water stagnation.

Proctor: Kirkus St. Sanitary Sewer & Drinking Water

Total Project Cost:

The total cost for this project is \$6.86 million. There are \$5.36 million in nonstate resources for the project:

\$2,361,600 Federal Highway Administration SAFE TEA LU HPP

Funding (Federal funds are obligated 20% per year

2005-09)

\$1,286,400 2009/2010 Federal Highway STP Funding

\$1,713,230 City of Proctor match on Federal Hwy Admin funds,

wetlands replacement credits, and road/bridge

work engineering

\$5,361,230 Total of non-state funds.

Other Considerations

City of Proctor will own and operate these new sanitary sewer and water mains, as well as the new road and bridge.

Project Schedule:

| Submit Facility Plan to MPCA | February 2007 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Public Hearing | April 2007 |
| Funding Applications | Ongoing |
| Environmental Studies | 2007 |
| Final Design | April to December 2007 |
| Soil Borings | 2007 |
| Easements/Right-of-Way | 2007 to April 2008 |
| Plans - Submit to Department of Hea | lth December 2007 |
| Finalize Plans/Specs | February 2008 |
| Bidding | April 2008 |
| Initiate Construction | June 2008 |
| Start-Up of System | October 2009 |
| | |

Project Contact Person

John M Foschi, City Administrator

City of Proctor 100 Pionk Drive

Proctor, Minnesota 55810 Phone: (218) 624-3641 Fax: (218) 624-9459

Email: cityhall@ci.proctor.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Proctor: Kirkus St. Sanitary Sewer & Drinking Water

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 78% of project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Proctor City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 18, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |
| | l |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,440,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Ramsey County)

PROJECT LOCATION: various locations in Ramsey County

Project At A Glance

Ramsey County requests state funding for three projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$1.5 million to design, construct, and equip the Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area with a permanent snow-making system for cross-country skiing, snowboarding and sledding.
- \$450,000 to design and construct a paved bicycle/pedestrian trail on the north side of Lower Afton Road between McKnight Road and Point Douglas Road.
- ♦ \$745,000 to design, develop, and construct at Tamarack Nature Center a nature play area, woodland play stream, children's garden, outdoor multiuse pavilion, and associated parking and access improvements.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area

This request is for \$1.5 million in state funding to design, construct and equip the Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area located in the city of St. Paul, Ramsey County, with a permanent snowmaking system for cross-country skiing, snowboarding and sledding.

In 2005, the Minnesota Nordic Ski Association and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources hosted a meeting of cross-country ski facility operators and advocates to discuss the status of Nordic skiing in the state in light of diminishing snow conditions. Participants agreed that the

future of Nordic skiing in the state depends on predictable snow (i.e., cross-country ski snowmaking). Moreover, the presence of skiable cross-country ski snow in the metropolitan area is essential in order to maintain participation at greater Minnesota cross-country ski areas and events such as cross-country ski races. Subsequently, a subcommittee of the group, with statewide representation, met and defined the following vision and mission for the Minnesota cross-country ski initiative.

VISION: Minnesota will become America's #1 Nordic ski destination.

MISSION: To establish multiple cross-country ski venues for all levels of skiing in the Twin Cities metropolitan area with lighting and snowmaking capability.

The subcommittee identified Battle Creek Regional Park as a priority site for snowmaking. The area is a well-established regional cross-country ski area, has excellent highway access, is located within minutes of downtown St. Paul and is currently the venue of choice for sectional and regional high school cross-country ski competition. Battle Creek was the host site for the American Cross-Country Skiers National Masters Ski Race in 2000. This highly successful event was planned again in 2005, but cancelled due to lack of snow.

Battle Creek Regional Park is a 1,440-acre park located in the cities of St. Paul and Maplewood. The park is owned and operated by Ramsey County. There are currently 14 kilometers of cross-country ski trails within the park, 3.8 kilometers of which are lighted. The project will install a permanent snowmaking system on 2.5 kilometers of the lighted ski trail, a teaching/training area for downhill skiing and snowboarding and a recreational sledding area. The snowmaking system will be designed with sufficient capacity to establish a cross-country ski trail with an 18-inch base of snow over a period of 7 to 10 days at temperatures of 27 degrees fahrenheit or less. Key elements of the system will include construction of a reservoir to cool the water for efficient snowmaking; pumping station and high pressure welded steel pipe and hydrants to distribute water; electrical connections and fixtures for snowmaking; portable snowmaking guns and grooming equipment to grade the snow; handle-style rope tow for downhill skiing and snowboarding and a seasonal building to house the pumping station and equipment.

The project has broad support from recreational cross-country skiers, area school districts, local and national ski race directors, the St. Paul Convention Bureau and potential corporate sponsors.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$3 million. Ramsey County, the city of St. Paul (Star Grant Program), county school districts and private sponsors will contribute matching funds in the amount of \$1.5 million.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The project is located within Battle Creek Regional Park which has been acquired using state, regional and local funds. A lighting system was installed in 1998 on 3.8 kilometers of the cross-country ski trail utilizing a state grant of \$67,500 combined with an equal match of local funds and private donations for a total project cost of \$135,000.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by Ramsey County and jointly operated by Ramsey County and the city of St. Paul.

Construction will begin in May 2009. A certificate of occupancy will be secured by October 2009.

Project Contact Person

Greg Mack, Director of Parks and Recreation Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department 2015 North Van Dyke Street Maplewood, Minnesota 55109

Phone: (651) 748-2500 Fax: (651) 748-2508

Email: Greg.Mack@co.ramsey.mn.us.

Priority 2: Lower Afton Trail Extension

This request is for \$450,000 in state funds to design and construct a paved bicycle/pedestrian trail on the north side of Lower Afton Road between McKnight Road and Point Douglas Road. The project is located in Ramsey

County within the city of St. Paul. The trail provides a regional connection between the heavily-populated neighborhoods within the cities of St. Paul, Woodbury and Maplewood to the National Great River Park. This trail segment represents the "missing link" for a trail network that has been constructed over a number of years by various agencies.

In 2006, the Minnesota legislature appropriated \$321,000 to Ramsey County for design and construction of a bicycle/pedestrian paved trail on the north side of Lower Afton Road between Century Avenue and McKnight Road. The total construction cost of the project was \$755,000. Local contributions to this project included \$100,000 from the city of Maplewood and \$334,000 from Ramsey County. In addition, Ramsey County provided the design and engineering services as well as contributed right-of-way for the project. The project incorporates innovative sustainable design practices in construction including significant use of recycled products and use of tear-off shingle scraps in the hot mix asphalt used for the bituminous surface. The project will be constructed in 2007.

In 2008, Ramsey and Washington Counties will begin reconstruction of Century Avenue located at the east end of the current project. The Century Avenue reconstruction will include a bicycle/pedestrian trail from I-494 to I-94. This north-south arterial trail will connect to a number of local trails within Washington and Ramsey counties resulting in an extensive network that will be greatly enhanced by the proposed 1-mile "missing link" connection between McKnight Road and Point Douglas Road. The trail network will provide local and regional connections to the Mississippi National Great River Recreation Area and various trail opportunities planned or constructed within this National Great River Park.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$1.12 million. It is anticipated that \$720,000 of the total project cost will be provided through the Federal Transportation STP Grant Program. The Metropolitan Council's Transportation Board (TAB) Funding and Programming Committee has approved the project ranking scores for federal transportation funding. The Lower Afton Trail Project was ranked 3rd out of 56 projects in the Transportation Enhancements category. The TAB is expected to finalize the project rankings by the end of 2007. To accommodate funding cycles, Ramsey County is prepared to advance interim matching funds that will be reimbursed by the Federal Grants.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 2004, the state appropriated \$321,000 as a matching grant to construct a paved trail on the north side of Lower Afton Road from Century Avenue to McKnight Road. The total cost of the trail construction project was \$755,000 funded by the city of Maplewood (\$100,000) and Ramsey County \$334,000) plus in-kind services for design, engineering, construction management and right-of-way.

Other Considerations

Ramsey County, through its Parks and Recreation Department, will own and operate the trail. The project will be designed by the Ramsey County Department of Public Works.

Construction will begin in June 2009. Construction will be completed in November 2009.

Project Contact Person

Greg Mack, Director of Parks and Recreation Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department 2015 North Van Dyke Street Maplewood, Minnesota 55109

Phone: (651) 748-2500 Fax: (651) 748-2508

Email: Greg.Mack@co.ramsey.mn.us.

Priority 3: Tamarack Nature Center (TNC) – Destination for Discovery

This request is for \$745,000 in state funding to support design, development and construction of high-priority "Destinations" within TNC, including a nature play area, woodland play stream, children's garden, outdoor multi-use pavilion (with restrooms), as well as associated parking and access improvements. TNC is a 320-acre facility located in White Bear Township, Ramsey County.

TNC is involved in a multi-year project entitled "Destination for Discovery." The central purpose of this project is to redirect TNC from the role of a traditional nature center towards becoming a more active, vital regional center for community engagement that uses the arts, humanities, sciences, adventure and play to connect people to nature.

The re-direction for TNC is inspired, in part, by Richard Louv's book *Last Child in the Woods: Saving our Children from Nature-Deficit Disorder (2005)*. Ramsey County is committed to taking the lead to ensure that "no child is left inside," and the Destination for Discovery project is designed as a statewide model on how to recreate opportunities for children and families to freely play and explore in nature.

In 2007, Ramsey County completed an updated Comprehensive Plan that included an interpretive plan, site plan and exhibit plan to support TNC's strategic direction of "Destination for Discovery." The plan identifies an array of specific destinations within the 320-acre nature center designed to encourage exploration and interaction with nature. These destinations will enhance programs and encourage self-directed discovery of the natural world. The project is designed to be implemented in multiple phases, with the Phase I proposed for 2008.

Phase I project includes:

- Design development, surveying, engineering and construction documents for Phase I of project (\$194,000) – Refine and finalize plans for the nature play area, woodland play stream, children's garden, outdoor multi-use pavilion (with restrooms), expanded parking and pedestrian access.
- Construction of Nature Play Area, Woodland Play Stream, Children's Garden (\$968,00) The nature play elements (tree trunks, upside down trees, stumps, hills, hallows, and boulders) will be connected by paths set among existing oak trees, shrubs and patches of grasses and forbs. A small pavilion, with restroom, will provide shelter and a place for parents to gather and watch their children play. A natural-looking channel of water will cascade and meander through the play area offering areas in which to play, experiment and observe flowing water. Water flowing from the stream will be piped to a shallow pond outfitted with stepping stones. The water from the stream will be recycled into a cistern located

in the proposed children's garden and potting shed where children and families together will care for plants and explore people's role in nurturing plants. Reusable resources will be discovered, as stored water from the stream will be used for irrigating the garden.

Parking Lot Expansion, Access Improvement (\$328,000) – Phase I will include a parking lot expansion (30 spaces) and construction of a drop off area to accommodate increased visitation by young children and people with physical limitations. This phase will also include paved trail connections between parking lots, the nature center, nature play area and children's garden.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$1.49 million. Ramsey County has applied for a \$132,000 IMLS grant. It is anticipated that Ramsey County, foundation grants and private sponsors will fund the balance of the County's match of \$613,000.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 2005, \$149,948 was awarded from the Institute for Museum and Library Services, Museums for America program to develop a comprehensive plan and exhibit plan for TNC's "Destination for Discovery." Plan to be complete in July 2007.

Other Considerations

Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department will own and operate the facilities.

Phase I construction will begin in October 2008 and will be completed September 2009.

Project Contact Person

Greg Mack, Director of Parks and Recreation Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department 2015 North Van Dyke Street Maplewood, Minnesota 55109

Phone: (651) 748-2500 Fax: (651) 748-2508

Email: Greg.Mack@co.ramsey.mn.us.

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 50% of project costs are to be provided from non-state | |
| | funding sources. | |
| | Priority 2: 64% federal funds will match 36% in state funding. | |
| | Priority 3: 50% of project osts are to be provided from non-state | |
| | funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priorities 1-3: Providing recreational opportunities is an important | |
| | state mission. The state has existing grant programs to provide financial assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| ٥. | Priorities 1-3: This project is viewed as having prrimarily a regional | |
| | benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priorities 1-3: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above for all projects. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | Priroties 1-3: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state | |
| 7. | funding for similar projects. | |
| /. | Does project compete with other facilities? Priorities 1-3: Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| 0. | Yes;the Ramsey County Board adopted a resolution of support for | |
| | the projects on June 12, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Predesign submittals are not required for these three projects. | |

Ramsey County RRA: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$10,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority)

PROJECT LOCATION: various locations in Ramsey County

Project At A Glance

The Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority is requesting state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$9 million to acquire land, design, and reconstruct the Union Depot facility to accommodate Amtrak, transit and interstate buses.
- \$1 million in state funding to acquire land, design, and construct parkand-ride lots located along the Rush Line Corridor

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Minnesota's Union Depot Multi-Modal Transit Hub

This request is for \$9 million in state funding to match already approved federal funding of approximately \$52 million for the Union Depot Multi-Modal Transit Hub. This funding will be used to acquire land, design and reconstruct the facility to accommodate Amtrak, transit and interstate buses. Future phases will provide facilities for commuter rail and intercity train service. The facility is on the National Register of Historic Places. Congress designated it as a project of national or regional significance in the current transportation legislation (SAFETEA-LU). As a multi-modal transit hub, the Depot will serve citizens from throughout the state.

Total Project Cost: The cost for this project is \$30 million in the phase to be funded in 2008, with further amounts in future years.

For all year, \$1.7 million in available Federal Transit Administration funding and \$50 million in federal funding for all phases of the project from the transportation authorization bill (SAFETEA-LU) have been approved. Additional funding from participating service providers and the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority may also be available.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The project received \$3.5 million in state bond funds in 2005 to match federal funds.

Other Considerations

The United States Postal Service currently owns the facility. They intend to relocate and are in negotiations with the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority for the sale of the property. The Authority will initially renovate the facility and operating plans will be developed.

Costs will be developed as the design and engineering work is completed in more detail. An Environmental Assessment and conceptual engineering are being completed in 2007. It is anticipated that construction crews would first arrive on site for projects as early as 2008 to begin interior rehabilitation work. Conversion of the outside of the facility would not occur until 2010. Work would be completed in 2012.

Project Contact Person

Kathryn Fischer, Director Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority 50 West Kellogg Boulevard, Suite 6560 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102

Phone: (651) 266-2762 Fax: (651) 266-2761

Email: Kathryn.fischer@co.ramsey.mn.us

Priority 2: Rush Line Corridor

This request is for \$1 million in state funding to acquire land, design, and construct park-and-ride lots located along the Rush Line Corridor along I-

Ramsey County RRA: Two Projects

35E/I-35 and Highway 61 from downtown St. Paul's Union Depot Multi-Modal Hub to Hinckley. This corridor is 80 miles, and covers five counties of Ramsey, Washington, Anoka, Chisago, and Pine. Traffic is growing at an increasing rate, as is traffic congestion along the corridor, and is expected to double in 20 years on I-35. This project has both local and regional significance as the park-and-ride lots are seen as a means to provide commuters with a transportation choice besides driving alone.

Total Project Cost: The total cost for this project is \$2.5 million for 2008. Federal funding in the amount of \$650,000 is anticipated in 2008 and 2009, and perhaps additional federal funding that has been requested for federal FY 2008.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The project received \$500,000 in state bond funds in 2005 to match federal funds.

Other Considerations

Each respective county or transportation/transit agency will own the parkand-ride facility, and will provide the maintenance for the facility.

Costs will be developed as the design and engineering work is completed in more detail. It is anticipated that construction crews would first arrive on site for projects as early as spring 2009, with construction completed that season.

Project Contact Person

Kathryn Fischer, Director Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority 50 West Kellogg Boulevard, Suite 6560 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102

Phone: (651) 266-2762 Fax: (651) 266-2761

Email: Kathryn.fischer@co.ramsey.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Ramsey County RRA: Two Projects

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? Priority 1: 70% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. Future phase costs are to be determined. Significant federal funds have been awarded that are available for all phases. Priority 2: 60% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. Future phase costs are to be determined. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Priorities 1 and 2: Transportation is an important state mission. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are responsible for transportation planning and programming and prioritizing state and federal formula funding for transportation projects. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? Priorities 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. Priority 2: This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? Priority 1: Unclear. Priority 2: It is unclear if additional bus service will be provided from the park and ride lots, and how such service would be funded. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? Priorities 1 and 2: These projects should be considered alongside the other transit plans and projects that are under discussion for the metropolitan area. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Not yet submitted. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Not yet submitted. |

Red Rock Corridor Commission: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$12,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Red Rock Corridor Commission JPB)

PROJECT LOCATION: Corridor from SE Minnesota to the Twin Cities

Project At A Glance

The Red Rock Corridor Commission is requesting state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$2 million for design, property acquisition, construction and matching federal funds for park and ride/pool lots and buses along the Red Rock Corridor, including Goodhue County.
- ♦ \$10 million for design, property acquisition, construction and matching federal funds for completion of design, property acquisition, and construction of high speed rail in Minnesota.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Red Rock Corridor Transit way

This request is for \$2 million in state funds for the design, property acquisition, construction and matching federal funds for park and ride/pool lots and buses along the Red Rock Corridor, including Goodhue County.

The Red Rock Corridor is locally and regionally significant. It runs parallel to U.S. 61 and I-94, which are principal arterials and part of the National Highway System and Interstate Highway System respectively. Additionally, the Canadian Pacific Railway and Burlington Northern Santa Fe mainlines parallel the corridor and connect the Twin Cities and Minnesota to Chicago and Seattle/Vancouver. Within the Red Rock Corridor, these freight rail corridors handle 4 percent of the nation's freight railroad traffic. Finally, the

Red Rock Corridor is also the same corridor utilized by Amtrak's Empire Builder and the proposed Midwest Regional Rail System allowing improvements in high speed rail to benefit Red Rock and vise versa.

The Red Rock Corridor is well positioned to provide convenient access from the suburbs to/from the central cities. It will utilize the St. Paul Union Depot Multi-modal hub as its downtown St. Paul station where it will connect to the Central Corridor Light Rail and to other transitways corridors including the Rush Line. In Minneapolis it will utilize the multi-modal station about to be constructed on the north side of downtown where Northstar Commuter Rail and Hiawatha Light Rail will meet.

In addition to its downtown connections, the Red Rock Corridor will connect southeast Metro and southeast Minnesota residents to the I-494 business strip in Bloomington, the University of Minnesota, and the Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport. The importance of the corridor is further supported through the inclusion of the Minnesota Department of Transportation's Commuter Rail System Plan and in the Metropolitan Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan.

Total Project Cost: The cost for this project is \$2 million in the phase to be funded in 2008, with further amounts in future years. The commission is requesting that all \$2 million be funded by the state.

For all phases of the project, \$1.8 million has been committed by the Federal government and \$130,000 by counties. In addition, \$1.5 million is identified for the Red Rock project as its portion of \$4 million in federal funds for the Red Rock, Rush Line, and Central Corridors.

The total cost for future phases is undetermined.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This project has received state funding in previous years. In 1998 the corridor received \$500,000 to complete a Commuter Rail Feasibility Study. In 2005 and 2006 the corridor received \$500,000 to complete environmental work, engineering, and for matching federal funds for implementing transit way improvements in the corridor.

Red Rock Corridor Commission: Two Projects

Other Considerations

Ownership of the facility will be by the county within which the facility is located.

Project Schedule:

Land Acquisition Fall 2008
Construction Start May 2009
Construction Completion October 2009
Project Opening October 2009

Project Contact Person

Mike Rogers, Associate Transportation Planner Washington County 11660 Myeron Road North Stillwater, Minnesota 55082 Phone: (651) 430-4338

Email: Michael.rogers@co.washington.mn.us

Priority 2: Midwest Regional Rail System - High-Speed Rail Corridor

This request is for \$10 million in state funds for the design, property acquisition, construction and matching federal funds for completion of design, property acquisition, and construction of high speed rail in Minnesota.

The Midwest Regional Rail System (MWRRS) runs for approximately 130 miles through the state connecting St. Paul to Chicago. Station stops in Minnesota include St. Paul, Red Wing, and Winona. Feeder bus would also connect Duluth, St. Cloud, Mankato, and Rochester to the stations along the rail corridor.

The MSRRS will utilize existing rail rights-of-way shared with freight and commuter services to connect Minnesota with eight other Midwestern states. By being part of a regional system, Minnesota is provided with the opportunity for efficiencies and economies of scale including better equipment utilization, more efficient employee and crew utilization, and train equipment unit cost savings resulting from volume discounts.

The primary purpose of the MWRRS is to meet current and future regional travel needs through significant improvements to the level and quality of passenger rail service. The rail service and its stations will also provide a stimulus for joint development in communities served by the system.

MWRRS Elements:

- Use 3,000 miles of existing rail rights-of-way to connect rural, small urban, and major metropolitan areas.
- ♦ Operation of a "hub and spoke" passenger rail system providing service to and through Chicago to locations throughout the Midwest.
- ♦ Introduction of modern train equipment operating at speeds up to 110 mph.
- ♦ Provision of multi-modal connections to improve the system access.
- Improvement in reliability and on-time performance.

Total Project Cost: The cost for this project is \$10 million in the phase to be funded in 2008, with further amounts in future years. The commission is requesting that all \$10 million be funded by the state.

For all phases of the project, \$8 million has also been requested from the federal government for completion of design, property acquisition, and construction of high speed rail in Minnesota.

The total cost for future phases is undetermined.

Other Considerations

The *Midwest Regional Rail System Executive Report* (2004) identifies Amtrak as the owner of the system. This would include the maintenance facilities, coaches, locomotives, and etc. However, the existing freight tracks will be owned by their respective railroads.

Train operations will be the responsibility of Amtrak, however; it is likely that a single or multiple freight railroads will provide the operations based on a competitive bid process.

Grants to Political Subdivisions

Project Narrative

Red Rock Corridor Commission: Two Projects

Project Schedule:

Environmental Impact Statement Fall 2008
Preliminary Engineering Fall 2010
Final Design Completion Fall 2011
Construction 2012-2016
Project Opening 2016/17

Project Contact Person

Mike Rogers, Associate Transportation Planner Washington County 11660 Myeron Road North Stillwater, Minnesota 55082

Phone: (651) 430-4338

Email: Michael.rogers@co.washington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Red Rock Corridor Commission: Two Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: All of the 2008 phase project costs are requested | |
| | from state funds, though some is used to match committed or | |
| | requested federal funds for all phases. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Transportation is an important state mission. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are responsible for | |
| | transportation planning and programming and prioritizing state and | |
| | federal funding for transportation projects. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | Priority 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| | Priority 2: This project is viewed as having primarily a regional and | |
| | national benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priority 1: Operating funds would be needed for bus service from | |
| | park and rides. | |
| | Priority 2: The request notes that some initial operating costs may be needed but service should be self-sufficient. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| ٥. | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | A memo detailing the May 2007 recommended motion of support | |
| 9. | that was to be approved by the Commission. Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| ð. | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | Predesign has not yet been undertaken for either project; however, | |
| | predesign review by the Department of Administration is likely not | |
| | required. | |

Richmond: Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Richmond)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Richmond, in Stearns County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1.5 million in state funding to assist in the financing of the Richmond Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) Expansion project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1.5 million in state funding to assist in the financing of the Richmond Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) Expansion. The project was constructed in 2006-07 and is nearly complete. This project was needed because:

- Existing facility is more than 35 years old. The city has done all it can with the existing facilities and with the budget they have to work with.
- Plant influent frequently exceeds permitted capacity
- Biosolids treatment and storage is currently inadequate
- Treatment violations and fines have been incurred
- We need to protect the Sauk River and Horseshoe Chain of Lakes watershed

The city of Richmond evaluated several alternatives before selecting a desired solution. They looked at:

- ♦ A new treatment plan at a new site
- Expansion/improvements at existing site with
 - \Rightarrow Package plant process
 - ⇒ Oxidation ditch process
 - \Rightarrow Sequencing batch reactor process
- Pump to Cold Spring's wastewater treatment plant and treat it there

After reviewing the five options described above, the city chose the expansion/improvements at existing site with an oxidation ditch process. This was identified as the most cost-effective solution to address Richmond's wastewater problems.

This project has regional significance due to the fact that Richmond's wastewater treatment plant discharges to the Sauk River just as it enters the Horseshoe Chain of Lakes, noted as one of the most complex lake/watershed areas in the state. The Sauk River is on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's list of impaired waters. It is designated with a fecal coliform contamination. This project will help to reduce the negative impact on the Sauk River. Additionally, the city is within 25 miles of St. Cloud potable water source. What happens "up stream" in Richmond impacts all those who are "down stream."

Total Project Cost

The total cost for this project is \$9.023 million. The city of Richmond received a loan from the Public Facilities Authority in the amount of \$9.023 million. In addition, the city received Federal Community Development Block Grant Funds in the amount of \$330,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Richmond owns and operates the facility. The project was constructed in 2006-07 and is nearly complete. The city received a low-interest loan from the Public Facilities Authority to finance this \$9 million-project. The city put a financing plan in place to pay off that debt, which balanced payment coming from existing residents (fixing existing WWTF problems) and growth from new residents (additional capacity). The growth component used a modest new housing permit figure of 20 new homes/year. However, even that modest number has not been seen due to the unusually weak housing market. Thus, the city is in need of financial assistance so that existing residents are not financially strapped any further. Already they have had to pay a \$4,950 assessment and they have seen their sewer usage increase to \$7.50 per 1,000 with a \$14.50 base fee. Using 250 gallons per day, this results in average monthly sewer bills of \$70.75 for Richmond residents. This compares to area average monthly sewer bills of \$20-\$35.

Richmond: Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion

Project Contact Person

Dan Coughlin, City Administrator City of Richmond P.O. Box 400 Richmond, Minnesota 56368-0400

Phone: (320) 597-2075 Fax: (320) 597-2975

Email: danc@ci.richmond.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend state funds for this request.

Richmond: Wastewater Treatment Facility Expansion

| Evaluation of Local Projects To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
|--|
| The city is asking to be reimbursed for costs already expended in |
| 2006-07. |
| Does project help fulfill an important state mission? No. |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? Unknown. |
| Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? Yes. Funding this request could set the precedent of assuming a larger state role when local governments' forecasts of additional economic development don't occur. |
| Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar situations with completed projects. |
| Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; The Richmond City Council adopted a Resolution of Support for the request on June 21, 2007. |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A |
| Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? This project has already been completed. |
| |

Rochester Mayo Civic Center Expension

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$37,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Rochester)

PROJECT LOCATION:

Project At A Glance

This appropriation request is for \$37.5 million for the design and construction of a convention center expansion and remodeling of portions of the Mayo Civic Center in Rochester.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This appropriation request is for \$37.5 million for the design and construction of a convention center expansion and remodeling of portions of the Mayo Civic Center in Rochester. Expanded convention facilities will allow the Mayo Civic Center to improve the quality of its meeting spaces and capture a greater share of the Upper Midwest convention business. This will result in a substantial economic impact to this region and the state of Minnesota. The expanded meeting facilities will also permit the civic center to free up more dates to accommodate a greater share of regional sporting events and musical presentations.

The expectations of today's meeting and event planners include the latest in plug-and-play technology in spacious facilities that have a hotel-like level of quality and finish. As these facilities begin to age, the demands of meetings and events surpasses the ability of the venue to meet those demands, especially in the target market areas of conventions and entertainment.

As a result, the Mayo Civic Center today sits at a crossroads. It has the potential to attract new businesses in the medical and high technology segments of the marketplace, but only if the facility is expanded and

significantly upgraded in quality. A lack of available dates and a large highly finished ballroom, an inadequate number of breakout meeting rooms, technology capabilities, and undersized venues all prevent the Civic Center from adequately accommodating a contemporary meeting. The Presentation Hall also needs a renovation to accommodate convention activities and other events.

In Rochester, Minnesota, it is estimated that due to the lack of dates, the lack of facilities and the appropriate level of finish, the community misses a potential annual economic impact of \$6.2-\$7.8 million in direct spending and \$12.5-\$15.8 million in total spending from lost conventions. In addition, at least 78 different events were turned away in 2006 due to facility inadequacies — and 55 percent of those events involved national or international visitors.

However, many opportunities exist for new meeting and event business. Rochester is in an excellent position to attract regional conventions/events of 1,000 people to the state and has the hotel, parking, restaurant and transportation infrastructure to support these events. Very few venues in the region have the facilities or level of finish to satisfy these events. In order to meet the demands for event dates, the expansion should provide opportunities to host simultaneously two events of 1,000 people each.

The presence of the Mayo Clinic and its expanding need for high technology medical meetings could be a large source of potential bookings. Other events supporting the medical, bioscience, hotel, restaurant and retail sectors have indicated an interest in holding their meetings in the Civic Center.

The University of Minnesota-Rochester and its biomedical sciences, medical and education-related courses will create a demand for off-campus meeting and seminar facilities beyond their regular campus.

Expanded meeting facilities will also open up dates for additional cultural, sporting and entertainment events in the existing spaces. In addition, strong bookings today confirm the need for expansion of the current facilities.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$75.1 million. The city would provide \$37.6 million through a food and beverage tax or hotel/motel tax, or a combination thereof.

Rochester Mayo Civic Center Expension

Other Considerations

The city of Rochester will both own and operate the facility. The Mayo Civic Center is a division of the city of Rochester Park and Recreation system. Construction is proposed to commence in March 2010 and be completed in August 2012.

Project Contact Person

Gary Neumann Assistant City Administrator City Hall 201 4th Street SE Rochester, Minnesota 55904

Phone: (507) 328-2000 Fax: (507) 328-2727

Email: gneumann@ci.rochester.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Rochester Mayo Civic Center Expansion

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| _ | • |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Economic development is an important state mission. The state role |
| | in funding civic center style projects is unclear and has varied |
| | considerably over time. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Rochester City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 18, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign was submitted to the Department of |
| | Administration and was found to be sufficient. |
| | |

Rockford: Flood Control Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,550,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Rockford)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Rockford, in Wright County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1.55 million from the city of Rockford to upgrade the flood control levee by making it wider, removing the trees, creating maintainable side slopes, stabilizing the riverbank along the Crow River in Wright County and acquiring two residential flood plain properties.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1.55 million from the city of Rockford to upgrade the flood control levee by making it wider, removing the trees, creating maintainable side slopes, stabilizing the riverbank along the Crow River in Wright County and acquiring two residential flood plain properties.

The Rockford levee needs to be raised and widened to 10 feet across at the top; trees must be removed that allow floodwaters to channel out through the root system. The south portion of the levee needs to be moved inland from the Crow River and two residential homes must be removed to accommodate moving the levee. The steep slopes along the south edge of the Crow River that have eroded will be protected by adding riprap to the toe of the slope along the river.

Storm sewer outlets along the levee need to be upgraded and riprap installed. The existing levee protects an estimated \$4 million of structures, which are mostly our historical downtown area and some residential property.

The project is important to both the city and the numerous recreational users of the Crow River because it will preserve the scenic character of the river while providing adequate protection to the city.

Total Project Cost

The total project cost is estimated to be \$1.55 million. The city is requesting funding in the amount of \$1.55 million from the state in 2008 for our project, which is 100 percent of the project costs.

For the past five years or more, the city has been exploring funding options to upgrade our flood control levee to widen to top, create better side slopes, remove trees, and stabilize the river banks. In addition to requesting 2008 State Appropriation funding the city may also apply to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for funds to assist with the costs of property acquisition for this project that could potentially contribute a total of \$250,000 towards the project.

Other Considerations

The city will own and maintain the flood control levee.
The project schedule is to start 8-1-08 with a completion date of 10-15-08.

Project Contact Person

Nancy Carswell, City Administrator 6031 Main Street Rockford, Minnesota 55373 Phone: (763) 477-6565 ext #22

Fax: (763) 477-4393

Email: nancyc@cityofrockford.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Rockford: Flood Control Project

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Floodwater control is an important state mission. The state has an |
| | existing grant program to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| | This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | No. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Rockford City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 26, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A predesign is not required for this type of project. |

Rockville: Rocori Trail

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,020,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Rockville)

PROJECT LOCATION: Richmond, Cold Spring & Rockville - Stearns county

Project At A Glance

The city of Rockville requests \$2.02 million in state funding to construct the Rocori Trail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2.02 million in state funding to construct the Rocori Trail that is proposed to be a separated, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant bicycle/pedestrian trail along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad corridor and will connect the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring and Rockville in Stearns County. This request has local, regional and state significance in the following ways:

Local Significance: The local significance of the Rocori Trail System is that it will provide an alternative mode of transportation in the Central Minnesota region, and health and recreational benefits for users. Once completed, the Rocori Trail will connect all three cities in the Rocori School District, Rockville, Cold Spring and Richmond; and two townships. This will decrease reliance on automobiles and allow young and old to bike or walk from one city to another to the schools, business districts, and points of interest that each community has to offer. The trail will also be used for health and recreational benefits.

This project will improve existing trail conditions by 100% as there are no separated facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians between these three communities. A very busy State Highway 23 connects the three cities and

residents are forced to use their vehicles to get from one place to another. A separated trail will provide them with the option of bicycling or walking to their destination. Cold Spring, middle of the trail, is only five miles from both Richmond and Rockville.

Regional Significance:

This will be a regional trail and usage will go beyond the residents of the three cities and two townships. Connections from the Rocori Trail to existing and future trail systems in the region will be relatively easy. It is envisioned that this trail will:

- ♦ Become part of the state's Glacial Lakes Trail System (Willmar to Richmond).
- Extend eastward through Waite Park into St. Cloud to connect to the Beaver Island Trail.
- ♦ Extend northward to St. Joseph to connect to the Lake Wobegon Trail

The proposed project meets Stearns County, city of Richmond, and city of Cold Spring comprehensive plan goals and objectives, and the trails initiative in the city of Rockville. Stearns County Parks Department has been very involved with the Rocori Trail planning efforts. They are planning to pick up where our trail leaves off (east side of Rockville) and extend the trail eastward into St. Cloud and connect to the Lake Wobegon Trail and the Beaver Island Trail.

State significance:

As mentioned above, the vision is that the Rocori Trail will become part of the state's Glacial Lakes Trail System. The Rocori Trail includes in its membership representatives from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) who have provided input from the early stages of planning. The DNR's master plan for the Glacial Lakes Trail System envisioned that the trail would extend eastward all the way into St. Cloud and Quarry Park. The proposed Rocori Trail would further DNR's vision of making that ultimate connection to Quarry Park.

Rockville: Rocori Trail

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$4.04 million. Non-state funding sources include:

SAFETEA-LU (Phase1) \$526,964 Private/Cities of Richmond, Cold Spring and Rockville \$361,051 SAFETEA-LU (Phase 2 & 3) \$1,132,020

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

The DNR will be maintaining the connecting Glacial Lakes State Trail and it would be a logical and cost effective consideration that they would maintain the balance of the system.

Other Considerations

Operation and maintenance of the Rocori Trail will be assured by agreements between Stearns County, the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring, and Rockville, and the Minnesota DNR.

Project Schedule:

Phase I (Richmond to Cold Spring)
Construction Start June 2010
Construction End October 2010

Phase II & III (Cold Spring through Rockville)

Construction Start June 2013
Construction End October 2013

Project Contact Person

Rena Weber, City Administrator City of Rockville 229 Broadway Street East P.O. Box 93

Rockville, Minnesota 56369 Phone: (320) 229-5879 Fax: (320) 240-9620

Email: RWeber@RockvilleCity.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Rockville: Rocori Trail

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission in |
| | Minnesota. The state has an existing grant program to provide |
| | financial assistance in this area. This project should be considered |
| | alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The project is viewed as having either a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | Unclear. the narrative suggests that DNR might maintain the trail; if |
| | that occurs then operating costs in the DNR budget for trails will |
| _ | increase. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local requests suggests that additional requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| ļ ' · | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Yes, the City Council of Cold Spring adopted a resolution of support |
| | on June 12, 2007, and the Richmond City Council adopted a |
| | resolution of support on June 21, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, |
| | trails or pathways. |

Roseau: East Diversion Flood Control Project

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$10,900,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Roseau)

PROJECT LOCATION: Roseau, and Spruce, Jadis twps, in Roseau County

Project At A Glance

The city of Roseau is requesting \$10.9 million in state funding to acquire land, predesign, construct, furnish and equip a river diversion project on the Roseau River.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$10.9 million in state funding to acquire land, pre-design, design, construct, furnish and equip a river diversion project on the Roseau River for flood control purposes the flood control works will be located in Roseau County, in the city of Roseau and the adjacent townships of Jadis and Spruce.

The East Diversion Flood Control Project has been designed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and has been approved by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for construction. Project authorization and a \$14 million appropriation is included in the 2007 U.S. House of Representatives and U.S. Senate Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) and is identified as a high priority project by the St. Paul District Corps of Engineers. A final WRDA bill needs to be developed in conference committee and approved.

The project has a cost-benefit ratio of \$3 in benefits for each \$1 in costs. Furthermore, the project will take 99% of the city of Roseau out of the 100-year floodplain and significantly reduce the probability of catastrophic flooding in the future. In 2002, three quarters of the city of Roseau was devastated by flooding from a flood measured as a 500+ year event.

Modeling has indicated that had the diversion project been in place for this flood event the existing river channel and the diversion would have conveyed the flood water past the city with minimal damages. However, without the project the city experienced a catastrophic flood resulting in public and private damages well over \$100 million. Extensive State and Federal funds were needed to rebuild Roseau post-flood and the East Diversion Project will protect all of the investment made by the state and federal government from future flood events.

The East Diversion project has local, regional and statewide significance because the project is necessary to protect the investments made in this community. Without assurance that reasonable flood protection exists in the community residents and industry (Polaris Industries) may choose to move to other locations (possibly out of state). Roseau is the primary regional trade, healthcare, government and employment center for the Lake of the Woods region. This project is necessary to maintain investment in our city, region and state by residents and major industry.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$24.5 million. The federal government will contribute \$15.6 million to the project and the city of Roseau will contribute \$812,121.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This request represents Phase II construction of the Roseau East Diversion Flood Control Project. The state of Minnesota, city of Roseau and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have cost shared the Project Feasibility Study (2003-2006 \$500,000 state funding) and Phase I construction (2007-08 Bridge Construction \$1 million state funding) of the project.

Roseau: East Diversion Flood Control Project

Other Considerations

The city of Roseau will own, operate and maintain the diversion channel. Project schedule:

| Bridge construction begins | May 1, 2008 |
|---|---------------|
| Bridge construction complete | Oct. 31,-2008 |
| Diversion Channel construction begins | May 1,-2009 |
| Diversion Channel completed-operational | April 1,-2010 |
| Recreation and Restriction Structure begins | April 1,-2010 |
| Recreation and Restriction Structure complete | April 1,-2011 |

Project Contact Person

Roseau: Todd Peterson, Community Development Coordinator

121 Center Street E; Suite 202;

P.O. Box 307

Roseau, Minnesota 56751 Phone: (218) 463-5003 Cell: (218) 689-0047 Fax: (218) 463-1252

Email: tpetersn@mncable.net

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Roseau: East Diversion Flood Control Project

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| '- | 60% of federal plus local funds will match 40% state funding. |
| 2. | |
| ۷. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Floodwater control is an important state mission. The state has an |
| | existing grant program to provide financial assistance in this area. |
| | This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | No. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Roseau City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | April 3, 2006. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for this type of project. |
| | |

Roseville: Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$695,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Roseville)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Roseville, in Ramsey County

Project At A Glance

The city of Roseville requests \$695,000 in state funding to design, construct, furnish, and equip improvements to the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$695,000 in state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip multiple improvements to the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL located in Roseville, Minnesota.

The Minnesota OVAL was built in 1993 with funds from the state of Minnesota and the city of Roseville. This request is due to the unexpected unusually high costs of operation and capital needs of a massive facility of this type. It has become too large of a financial burden for the city of Roseville to continue alone. The city of Roseville requests the participation from the state of Minnesota to assist in the continued operation of this joint project and asset to our state through financial participation in capital projects funding. The specific request is for assistance with the much needed capital needs.

The OVAL was constructed as a partnership between the state of Minnesota and the city of Roseville. This world class facility has established itself as one of Minnesota's most visible venues for regional, national and international events. The OVAL is unique and features the world's largest outdoor refrigerated ice sheet, with 81 miles of refrigeration piping and 110,000

square feet of concrete. The OVAL offers a wide variety of recreational opportunities including: ice speed skating, ice hockey, public ice skating, ice bandy, in-line hockey and speed skating, aggressive sports (inline skating, skateboarding, biking/blading/boarding ramps) and one of the largest family New Year's Eve party in the Metro area.

The intended use of the facility at the time of construction was of regional significance and it has proven itself in that category. The OVAL has been host to many regional, national and international events including multiple World Junior Speed Skating Championships, World Cups in Speedskating and Bandy plus the annual America's Cup, John Rose Cup, Junior National Long Track Speed Skating Championship, St. Paul Winter Carnival Events, etc. Recreational skating draws more than 1,000 participants at any one session from the entire metro area and the state of Minnesota.

In 2004, OVAL experienced major mechanical issues that prevented the use of artificial ice. This problem has been temporarily resolved through corporate philanthropy, but the issue of long term capital funding needs has not yet been resolved.

The OVAL serves a great number of patrons from outside of the city of Roseville. It is estimated that as many as 60 percent – 70 percent of the regular users are from the greater Twin Cities metro area and out state Minnesota or the greater Midwest proving it truly as a state and regional facility.

We believe that continued joint participation by the of the state of Minnesota and the city of Roseville on this jointly funded and constructed OVAL will continue to further strengthen our cooperative relationships and result in better services to our constituents.

Total Project Cost

The total project cost is \$695,000.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 1991/92 the state of Minnesota contributed funds to initially construct the Minnesota OVAL; in 1998 additional funds were provided to construct a

Roseville: Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

banquet/meeting rooms and locker rooms; and in 2006 \$500,000 of a \$965,000 request was awarded to add restrooms and to improve the efficiency and safety of the facility.

In 2006 a similar request for \$960,000 was made to the state of Minnesota and \$500,000 was graciously granted. The grant was very much appreciated. It was understood that there were many requests at that time necessitating the need to grant a lesser amount. This specific request for 2008 is for the remaining projects that were not funded in 2006 plus one additional much needed project.

Other Considerations

The city of Roseville will continue to own and operate the Minnesota OVAL. We believe that it is imperative and in the best interests of Roseville and Minnesota residents that the state of Minnesota and the city of Roseville work cooperatively to ensure the success of the OVAL. It is a tremendous facility, extremely well utilized by all of our constituents and an asset not only for the state of Minnesota but for a draw and recognition nationally and internationally. To ensure this facilities future it is imperative that the state of Minnesota be involved financially with capital items. It has become too big of a burden for the Roseville taxpayers to go it alone.

The anticipated start date of the project is summer of 2008 and it is expected to be completed by fall/winter of 2008.

Project Contact Person

Lonnie Brokke, Director of Parks and Recreation 2660 Civic Center Drive Roseville, Minnesota 55113

Phone: (651) 792-7101 Fax: (651) 792-7006

Email: lonnie.brokke@ci.roseville.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Roseville: Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state role in funding ice arena projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to another. |
| _ | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | A resolution of support dated 06/11/07 has been received from the |
| | city of Roseville. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Predesign is not required for local government projects where the |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. |
| | concluded in the contract of the fillimon. |

Scott County: Regional Public Safety Training Facility

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,200,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Scott County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Sand Creek Township, in Scott County

Project At A Glance

Scott County is requesting \$3.2 million in state funding to complete the initial phase of a Regional Public Safety Training Facility project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3.2 million in state funding to complete the design work, refurbishing of existing spaces, the construction of new spaces, and the purchase of furnishings and equipment for the Regional Public Safety Training Facility.

In response to a request in 2006 for \$4.2 million, the state provided an initial \$1 million that was combined with \$5 million in local funding to move the project forward. The project is nearing completion of the initial phase of the project, and this request will fund the remaining work.

Presently, there are few facilities within the state of Minnesota where the various public safety providers and emergency responders (e.g., fire, law enforcement, hazardous material teams, public works, et cetera) are able to train independently and/or collectively. While several larger cities within the metropolitan area own and operate independent fire and/or police training sites, there are no combined training facilities (with the possible exception of Camp Ripley). In addition, within most of the smaller counties -- such as Scott, Carver, Nicollet, Sibley, and LeSueur Counties -- there are few live fire ranges available for law enforcement training and qualification. As a result,

many departments either provide limited training, often at unlicensed and poorly equipped sites, or forego critically needed training altogether.

In 2004, the Scott County Association for Leadership and Efficiency (SCALE) commissioned a study to assess both the need for and feasibility of a possible combined training facility that could support all aspects of public safety. This study concluded that there is substantial need, and -- by combining the training requirements of the fire departments, law enforcement agencies, public works and/or transportation departments, emergency medical services, and public utility departments into a single facility – such a facility would provide not only more efficient and economical training, but also more comprehensive and integrated training and services.

While the improved cost-effectiveness is important, the lack of facilities and the functional shortcomings of many of the existing training facilities make the need for an improved training facility even more pressing. Most departments have no efficient means of conducting scenario training (involving multiple responders for many emergencies, including large commercial or high-rise fires, emergencies involving hazardous materials, high-angle and confined space rescues). Moreover, many of the existing training activities take place in facilities that fail to meet any type of training standards for live burn exercises and joint operations.

This Regional Public Safety Training Facility will provide a resource within – yet on the outskirts -- of the Twin Cities metropolitan area for specialized and legally required training, and would constitute a resource that could meet the needs of many agencies both within and outside the metro area (including, but not necessarily limited to, Scott, Carver, Sibley, Nicollet, and LeSueur Counties). Much of the training equipment that will be provided at this facility is cross-functional; a variety of departments (e.g., fire, police, and public works) require training for tunnel extractions and elevated tower operations, including rescues.

In 1999, the Minnesota Legislature directed the Commissioner of Public Safety to initiate a process for the development of plans and strategies to be used in assess proposals for funding of regional training facilities. In complying with the legislature's directive, the commissioner developed a task force, conducted a series of meetings with various agencies, and issued two reports. The general recommendations provided to the legislature included:

Scott County: Regional Public Safety Training Facility

- A regional proposal must address all of the needs of the regions for State, Federal, and local training requirements
- Multi-jurisdictional commitments
- Regional funding to provide 50 percent of construction costs
- Regional funding to provide 100 percent of operational costs
- ♦ Identified need, service area, and student populations
- Specialized training that will be offered exclusively within the region
- Preference given to proposals for collaborating cities and counties
- Consideration and inclusion of state college resources
- Address law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical training needs; and
- Re-use of existing facilities

The Regional Public Safety Training Facility being built by the SCALE, and its regional partners not only meets but, in many respects, *exceeds* the recommendations made to the legislature. The facility will be able to address all of the police, fire, and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) needs within the region and incorporates added uses that will bring in public works providers – an often overlooked component of large scale public safety responses. It has wide support within the region; is being collaboratively developed, designed, constructed and operated by multiple counties and cities; has included college resources within the region (both in planning and operations); reuses existing infrastructure and facilities; and clearly meets the required funding from the regional partners.

The site is owned by Scott County, and it is conveniently located just off of Highway 169 – thus readily accessible to an array of cities and counties within the region. In planning for this facility, Scott County and the other members of SCALE anticipated that it would be a comprehensive, regional resource; as such, the site includes a wide variety of training options, combined with kitchen, laundry, shower, and lodging facilities that would both support and encourage use by a wide range of governmental units.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$9.7 million. The state contributed \$1 million in bond funding in 2006, and local governments and entities in the project's region have contributed another \$5.5 million for the project.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

The project received a \$1 million appropriation in the 2006 Bonding Bill.

Other Considerations

Scott County will own and manage the facility. Construction will begin in June of 2007 and will be completed by June of 2008.

Project Contact Person

Gary L. Shelton, Deputy County Administrator 200 West 4th Avenue Shakopee, Minnesota 55379 Phone: (952) 496-8105

Email: gshelton@co.scott.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Scott County: Regional Public Safety Training Facility

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 57% of total project costs are to be provided from local government |
| | funds. The state made an appropriation of \$1 million in 2006. This |
| | request is to complete the project started in 2006. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| ٥. | This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Providing public safety training facilities is an important state mission |
| | in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local |
| | projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | The degree to which the project competes with other facilities |
| | depends on the services offered and the size of the geographic |
| 8. | service area. Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| ο. | Yes; the Scott County Board adopted a resolution of support on June |
| | 14, 2005. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| 0. | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Yes, a project predesign was submitted to the Department of |
| | Administration and was found to be sufficient. |

Silver Bay: Seven Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,980,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Silver Bay)

PROJECT LOCATION: various locations in Silver Bay, in Lake County

Project At A Glance

The city of Silver Bay requests state funding for seven projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$650,000 to repair streets and related infrastructure due to deferred repairs
- ♦ \$700,000 to convert a former public school to mixed use
- ♦ \$125,000 to provide infrastructure improvements to the city's business park
- ♦ \$805,000 to provide improvements to the state marina at Silver Bay
- ♦ \$100,000 to facilitate park improvements and campground development
- ♦ \$560,000 for an addition to the public library
- ♦ \$40,000 to help construct a salt shed for the Street Department

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Streets and Related Infrastructure Repair

This request is for \$650,000 in state funding to repair streets and related infrastructure due to deferred repairs from negative impacts of multiple mine shutdowns and layoffs over the years. Now we are faced with more and more of an aging population on fixed income.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$1.3 million. The city of Silver Bay will contribute \$650,000 to the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility. The anticipated project start date is 8-15-2008 and the project is will be completed by 9-1-2009.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin.
7 Davis Drive
Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614
Phone: (218) 226-4408
Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Priority 2: Mary MacDonald Center

This request is for \$700,000 in state funding to convert a former public school to mixed use-in particular a business incubator.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$1.4 million. The city of Silver Bay will contribute \$700,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin. 7 Davis Drive Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614 Phone: (218) 226-4408 Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Silver Bay: Seven Projects

Priority 3: Business Park Improvements

This request is for \$125,000 in state funding to provide improvements to the city's business park such as water, sewer, stormwater and/or wetland work.

Priority 3 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the business park improvements project is \$250,000. The city of Silver Bay will contribute \$125,000 to the project.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility. The state date of the project is projected to be 8-15-2008. The project will be completed by 9-1-2009.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin. 7 Davis Drive Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614 Phone: (218) 226-4408

Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Priority 4: Marina Improvements

This request is for \$805,000 in state funding to provide improvements to the state marina at Silver Bay.

Priority 4 Total Project Cost: The total project cost of the state marina improvement project is \$805,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility. The anticipated start date of the project is 8-15-2008 and the projected completion date is 9-1-2009.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin.

7 Davis Drive

Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614

Phone: (218) 226-4408 Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Priority 5: Park and Recreation improvements

This request is for \$100,000 in state funding to facilitate park improvements and campground development, including an estimated 20 site Recreational Vehicle and Tent.

Priority 5 Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$200,000. The city of Silver Bay will contribute \$100,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility. The anticipated start date of the project is 8-15-2008 and the projected completion date is 9-1-2009.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin. 7 Davis Drive Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614 Phone: (218) 226-4408 Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Priority 6: Library Addition

This request is for \$560,000 in state funding for an addition to the public library that serves a large area.

Silver Bay: Seven Projects

Priority 6 Total Project Cost: The total project cost of the library addition is \$1.12 million. The city of Silver Bay will contribute 50 percent of the project cost.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility. The anticipated start date of the project is 8-15-2008 and the projected completion date is 9-1-2009.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin. 7 Davis Drive Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614 Phone: (218) 226-4408 Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Priority 7: Street Department Salt Shed

This request is for \$40,000 in state funding to help construct a salt shed that will help reduce storm water runoff and provide a facility that mixes road sand and salt that is on occasion a resource to the county and Minnesota Department of Transportation when their resources run low.

Priority 7 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$80,000. The city of Silver Bay will contribute 50 percent of the total project cost.

Other Considerations

The city of Silver Bay will own and operate the facility. The anticipated start date of the project is 8-15-2008 and the projected completion date is 9-1-2009.

Project Contact Person

Tom Smith, City Admin. 7 Davis Drive Silver Bay, Minnesota 55614 Phone: (218) 226-4408 Fax: (218) 226-4068

Email: tsmith@silverbay.com

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

Silver Bay: Seven Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|----------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | Priorities 1-3: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local |
| | government funds. |
| | Priority 4: No non-state funds will be contributed. |
| | Priorities 5-7: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local |
| | government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Priorities 1-3: The state has an existing grant program to provide |
| | financial assistance in this area. |
| | Priority 4: Providing public water access is an important state |
| | mission. The state agency seeks a manageable level of state bond |
| | financing for public water access in each capital budget cycle. This |
| | request should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| | Priority 5: The state has an existing grant program to provide |
| | financial assistance in this area. |
| | Priorities 6-7: The state mission in funding these types of projects is |
| | unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | Priorities 1-3: These projects are viewed as having primarily a local |
| | benefit. |
| | Prioirty 4: This project is viewed as having primarily a local or |
| | regional benefit. |
| | Priorities 5-7: These projects are viewed as having primarily a local |
| | benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | Priorities 1-3: No. |
| | Priority 4: Unclear. |
| | Priorities 5-7: No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Priorities 1-7: No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | Priorities 1-3: The number of this type of local request suggests that |
| | additional requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of |
| | government if the state provides funding for this project. |
| | Priority 4: If funded, other jurisdictions could seek state funding for |
| | similar projects. |
| | Priorities 5-7: The number of this type of local request suggests that |
| | additional requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of |
| <u> </u> | government if the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Priorities 1- 7: Not significantly. |

Has local governing body provided a resolution of support?
Yes, the Silver Bay City Council adopted Resoultion # 2007-19,
which supports the requests for all seven projects, in priority order.
 Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting?
Yes.
 Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?
Priority 1: Predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways.
Priority 2, 5, 6 and 7: Predesign is not required for local government projects where the construction costs are less than \$1.5 million.
Priority 3: Predesign is likely not required for this type of project.
 Priority 4: Unclear from the information presented whether a predesign is required.

South St Paul: N. Urban Regional Trail Underpass

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,400,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (South Saint Paul)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of South St Paul, in Dakota County

Project At A Glance

The city of South St. Paul requests \$1.4 million in state funding for the construction of a box culvert underpass at 19th Avenue to serve the North Urban Regional Trail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This capital project request is for \$1.4 million in state funding for the construction of a box culvert underpass at 19th Avenue to serve the North Urban Regional Trail (NURT). The NURT was constructed in 2002 as a partnership between Dakota County and the city of South St. Paul and regionally services a variety of trail users throughout northern Dakota County. During construction there was significant obstacle identified at 19th Avenue in South St. Paul's Simon's Ravine. The NURT travels west to east through Kaposia Park via Simon's Ravine connecting Dakota County's Thompson Park to South St. Paul's Kaposia Park to the Mississippi River and south to Inver Grove Heights. The 19th Avenue obstacle exists as a Department of Natural Resources (DNR) classified low-risk land dam spanning Simon's Ravine thus creating a natural barrier for trail users. As the trail construction continued, slopes as great as 20 percent were created to push the trail up and over the 19th Avenue obstacle from the trail route at the bottom of the ravine. The slopes are not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) or Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) compliant according to trail standards, coupled with the hazardous situation of crossing a very busy road at 19th Avenue. The NURT is a multi-modal regional amenity that seeks the solution for creating a more gradual and, more

importantly, a safe bypass at 19th Avenue. Listed below are two brief narratives outlining the regional amenities that the bypass at 19th Avenue will serve:

- ♦ Regional Trail And Bridge Construction (Completed, \$6.7 million) Through leadership and advanced funding, South St. Paul has helped construct a significant portion of NURT that now extends approximately five miles along the Mississippi River banks. The trail includes three separate pedestrian bridges and a box underpass that provide safe and accessible use by multi-modal trail users. The single remaining obstacle is 19th Avenue in South St. Paul with trail grades that are 15 percent on the east side approach and 20 percent on the west side approach.
- ♦ Simon's Ravine Trailhead Construction (Completed, \$200,000) The city of South St. Paul has constructed a trailhead facility on the east side of Concord Street (TH 156). This trailhead serves users of the NURT. The NURT extends southerly along the Mississippi River and westerly through Simon's Ravine to 19th Avenue in South St. Paul and eventually Dakota County's Thompson Park located in West St. Paul. This locally funded facility includes parking, restroom and picnic facilities at the foot of the pedestrian bridge over Concord Street (TH 156), a sculpture, an information kiosk and a memory path. A local non-profit entity, River Environmental Action Project (REAP) funded the sculpture and paver stone memorial to compliment city funding and donations from local businesses that supported the balance of this project.

The NURT has quickly become a regional draw for all types of trail users. Following in the footsteps of the construction of three pedestrian bridges and one box culvert, the underpass at 19th Avenue remains the final piece of the puzzle in creating truly accessible and safe bypasses for users of the NURT.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this phase of the NURT project is \$1.4 million. Since 2002 South St. Paul has helped construct a significant portion of the NURT.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 1999 a \$200,000 two to one matching grant was received from the state of Minnesota for ravine improvements in order to construct the NURT trail from

South St Paul: N. Urban Regional Trail Underpass

TH 52 to 19th Avenue in South St. Paul. In 2002 a state appropriations bill provided \$600,000 (non-matching) grant for ravine improvements in order to construct the NURT through Simon's Ravine from 19th Avenue to Concord Street (TH 156) in South St. Paul.

Other Considerations

This facility will be owned and operated by Dakota County. Project schedule:

- ♦ August 2008 Design and specifications prepared
- ♦ December 2008 Contract bid and award processes
- ♦ March 2009 Contractors begin construction
- August 2009 − Project completed

Project Contact Person

Stephen P. King, City Administrator City of South St. Paul 125 Third Avenue North South St. Paul, Minnesota 55075

Phone: (651) 554-3202 Fax: (651) 554-3201

Email: steve.king@southstpaul.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

South St Paul: N. Urban Regional Trail Underpass

| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
|-----|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission. |
| | However, the degree to which local projects should be funded, as |
| | contrasted with state projects, is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | The project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the South St Paul City Council adopted a resolution of support |
| | on June 27, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |
| | |

St Cloud: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$17,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (St Cloud)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of St Cloud and Haven Twp in Sherburne

County

Project At A Glance

The city of St. Cloud requests state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- \$15 million to cover 50 percent of the cost of an expansion of the St. Cloud Civic Center
- \$2 million to purchase 800 acres adjacent to the St.Cloud Regional Airport

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: St. Cloud Civic Center Expansion Project

This request is for \$15 million in state funding to assist in the planning, design, construction and equipment costs for a \$30 million expansion of the St. Cloud Civic Center.

Background: The St. Cloud Civic Center is a convention center located in downtown St. Cloud along the Mississippi River. The city of St. Cloud owns and operates the Civic Center, which serves the convention and meeting space needs of the immediate St. Cloud area and the entire central Minnesota region. The existing facility opened in 1989 and contains 103,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of space including two large rooms (combined area of 42,000 sq. ft.), four meeting room suites (combined area of 12,600 sq. ft.), as well as commensurate common space. The existing facility also includes two levels of underground parking with a total of 365 parking spaces.

The St. Cloud Civic Center hosts a variety of convention center activities. The Civic Center averages 400 events per year, including:

Project Narrative

- ♦ 230 to 250 small meetings and small conferences
- ♦ 45 to 55 conventions, major conferences, and trade shows
- ♦ 20 to 25 consumer shows (car shows, home shows, outdoor sports show, etc.)
- ♦ 80 to 100 social and entertainment events (banquets, weddings, parties, concerts, etc)

In the year 2000, total daily attendance for all Civic Center events was 285,873 people. Using industry standards, these visitors resulted in an estimated \$18.7 million to the St. Cloud area's economy. Once the expansion is completed, total daily attendance is expected to increase to 431,200 visitors, resulting in an estimated \$31 million annually to the St. Cloud area's economy.

Additional Space Needed: The Civic Center has suffered from a shortage of space during the past ten years. The shortage is particularly acute during the prime convention seasons of mid-February through mid-April and August through mid-November. Unless the Civic Center is expanded, the shortage of space has resulted in the loss of existing and potential business. The space shortage problem is manifested in two ways. First, many of the large conventions, particularly those with an accompanying trade show, need more square footage than is currently available. Presently, 13 major Civic Center clients have expressed concerns that the Civic Center lacks adequate space for their events, which could result in the loss of their business. Secondly, there is not sufficient space in the Civic Center to host more than one moderately sized event simultaneously.

The proposed expansion will both increase the Civic Center's meeting space and enhance the downtown commercial district. The Civic Center serves as an anchor within St. Cloud's downtown commercial, government, and entertainment district. The proposed expansion will likely result in the construction of an additional 100 to 150 room downtown hotel property to service the increased Civic Center business. The proposed expansion is expected to generate new eating and entertainment establishments as well.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the St. Cloud Civic Center Expansion project is \$30 million. A local contribution of \$15 million would be

St Cloud: Two Projects

made towards the project using proceeds from an existing 1 percent food and beverage tax to retire debt incurred for the project.

Other Considerations

The city of St. Cloud will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Lyle Mathiasen Civic Facilities Director City of St. Cloud 10 4th Avenue South St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301 Phone: (320) 650-2715

Fax: (320) 650-2715 Fax: (320) 255-9863

Email: lyle.mathiasen@ci.stcloud.mn.us

Priority 2: St. Cloud Regional Airport Property Acquisition

This request is for \$2 million in state funding to purchase approximately 800 acres of land adjacent to the St. Cloud Regional Airport. The airport is located in Sherburne County and owned by the city of St. Cloud.

As the airport expands, there is a need to control the property around the airport and within the runway safety zones. Property ownership will allow for the safe operation of aircraft into and out of the airport. And, there is a need to purchase land to accommodate future growth at the airport documented in the Airport Master Plan.

The Master Plan for the St. Cloud Regional Airport indicates the need for an ultimate 8,000 foot runway to be constructed in the near future, which would be an additional 1,000 foot extension to the current 7,000 foot runway. The Master Plan also indicates the need to lengthen and widen the crosswind runway, as well as construct a future parallel runway. These improvements cannot be completed within the current airport perimeter. Implementation of the Master Plan's improvements and the associated necessary safety zones depend on the acquisition of additional land.

Land acquisition is extremely important to the future growth of the airport. Without it, the airport simply will not grow. If adjacent land is not purchased soon, non-compatible land uses will continue to encroach upon the airport, which will either limit the ability of the airport to expand or greatly increase the cost of expansion in the future, potentially pricing the airport out of expansion.

The airport will impact other economic growth opportunities in central Minnesota. The St. Cloud Regional Airport is a regional asset. The growth of the St. Cloud Regional Airport is vital to the economic growth of the central Minnesota region. The fact that a recently completed study by the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), Office of Aeronautics, defined the St. Cloud Regional Airport as a Tier 2 airport indicates that MnDOT Aeronautics realizes the importance of the St. Cloud Regional Airport within the state and national transportation systems, further signifying the state and regional nature of this project.

In summary, purchasing this land will enable the airport to control the development of adjacent property, ensure compatible land uses as they relate to airport operations, and implement the Master Plan. This land is greatly needed for the future safe operation and development of the St. Cloud Regional Airport. Almost all of the land needed for future development is currently open space. The time to purchase land is now, before it becomes residential property that is extremely costly.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the St. Cloud Regional Airport Property Acquisition project is \$4 million. Funding from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is being sought since the FAA will participate in land acquisition for land being acquired as part of a specific, eligible Airport Improvement Project. Some of the land involved here may be eligible at a later date. Additionally, the city of St. Cloud has passed a local option sales tax, of which a portion will be used for the purchase of land around the airport. The city also has local funds available to put toward this project, but the exact amount is unknown.

St Cloud: Two Projects

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 2006 the city of St. Cloud was awarded \$2 million in state bonding for land acquisition.

Other Considerations

The city of St. Cloud will own and operate the facility. Every effort will be made to access/leverage federal funds for the future acquisition of land around the St. Cloud Regional Airport, which could potentially minimize a request for the 2010 time period. The project will need additional resources totaling \$4 million in FY 2010 and \$10 million in FY 2012.

Project Contact Person

William P. Towle, Airport Director St. Cloud Regional Airport 1550 45th Avenue Southeast, Suite 1 St. Cloud, Minnesota 56304

Phone: (320) 255-7292 Fax: (320) 650-3255

Email: william.towle@ci.stcloud.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor recommends general obligation bonding of \$2.0 million for the St. Cloud Regional Airport land acquisition project, through a grant agreement with the Minnesota Department of Transportation.

The governor does not recommend capital funds for the Civic Center project.

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | P1: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government | |
| | funds. | |
| | P2: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government | |
| | funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | P1: The state role in funding civic center and community center style | |
| | projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to | |
| | another. | |
| | P2: Providing airport facilities is an important state mission. The state | |
| | has existing grant programs to provide financial assistance for airport | |
| | development. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | P1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional | |
| | benefit | |
| 4. | P2: This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| 4. | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| ٥. | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| Ŭ. | P1: The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if | |
| | the state provides funding for this project. | |
| | P2: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for | |
| | similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | P1 and P2: Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the St Cloud City Council adopted resolutions of support for the | |
| | two projects on June 4, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A predesign has not yet been submitted for the priority #1 project, the | |
| | convention center expansion. (A predesign is not required for the | |
| | priority #2 project, airport land acquisition.) | |

St Louis & Lake Counties RRA: North Shore Express

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,655,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (St Louis & Lake Counties RRA)

PROJECT LOCATION: Corridor from St Lous to Hennepin counties

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$1.7 million in state funding to acquire land, railroad right of way, facilities, and for predesign, design expenses, construction, and improvements for the North Shore Express passenger rail system from Duluth to the Twin Cities.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml.

Project Description

This request is for \$1.7 million in state funding to acquire land, railroad right of way, facilities, and for predesign, design expenses, construction, and improvements for the North Shore Express passenger rail system from Duluth to the Twin Cities to be located in St. Louis, Carlton, Pine, Kanabec, Isanti, Anoka, and Hennepin Counties. This amount will be matched by local political subdivision contributions for a comprehensive study, and by federal US Department of Transportation funding of \$1.7 million.

The goal will be to develop and provide a passenger rail system for efficient and affordable transportation for travelers in the Twin Cities to Duluth corridor. The system will link corridor attractions and tourism centers with the urban communities by providing effective transportation options for business, commuter, social and tourist travelers. The passenger rail system will be designed for higher speeds to compete with automotive traffic and be expandable to meet the growing population and transportation needs of the state and region.

The North Shore Express truly has statewide significance, building upon the statewide rail transportation system recently expanded with the Hiawatha and North Star connections. Significant state, federal, and local funding has been dedicated to rail as alternatives to automotive traffic, and this initiative continues this investment. Increasing numbers of people are choosing to live outside of the Twin Cities, but need to commute to work in the metropolitan area. By providing for high speed transportation from Duluth to the Twin Cities, this transportation corridor will help move thousands of people between home and work, and for various social, tourism, and business purposes.

The phase of the project will insure the system meets local and statewide needs by working with local communities, freight railroads, and the Department of Transportation. In addition, it will fund the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) which confers program readiness for federal funding. Funding will be used for predesign and design expenses, construction, acquisition, and improvements along the railroad corridor. Also, funding will be used to acquire, improve, and construct railroad right of way and facilities to complete the corridor.

By providing rail transportation corridors into rural areas and greater Minnesota, this project will serve as an important link joining all Minnesotans in a comprehensive transportation system.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this 2008 phase of the project is \$3.331 million. State funding will be matched with \$1.7 million in federal funding, as well as with \$400,000 in funding from affected local governments.

Other Considerations

Facility acquisition, improvements, and equipment will be owned and the system will be operated by the St. Louis and Lake Counties Regional Railroad Authority under cooperative agreements with other regional railroad authorities and political subdivisions—along with private sector railroads and operations. Construction to begin 8-1-08 and completed 7-30-10.

St Louis & Lake Counties RRA: North Shore Express

Department of Finance note: St. Louis county received an appropriation of \$1.3 million in the 2006 bonding bill, in part to "match federal money for preliminary engineering, environmental studies and construction" within the rail corridor.

Project Contact Person

Mr. Robert Manzoline, Executive Director St. Louis and Lake Counties Regional Railroad Authority 801 SW Highway 169 Chisholm, Minnesota 55719

Phone: (218) 254-2575 Fax: (218) 254-2972

Email: bob.manzoline@ironworld.com

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

St Louis & Lake Counties RRA: North Shore Express

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 50% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Transportation is an important state mission. Mn/DOT is the state agency responsible for developing commuter rail. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the St. Louis and Lake Counties Regional Rail Authority adopted a resolution of support on June 6, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A predesign is not required for this project. | |

St Louis County: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (St Louis County)

PROJECT LOCATION: locations in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

St. Louis County is requesting state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$900,000 to extend water and sewer and other infrastructure improvements in central St. Louis County to support the creation of a statewide equestrian facility.
- ♦ \$600,000 to reconstruct the failing Midway Park Sanitary Sewer.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Creation of a statewide equestrian facility through extension of water and sewer and other infrastructure improvements in central St. Louis County

\$900,000 in being requested in state bonding to help construct a \$1.8 million expansion and extension of water and sewer from the city of Chisholm to the North St. Louis County Fairgrounds which is located across Highway 169 from the Chisholm and adjacent to Ironworld Discovery Center. The extension of these utilities to this site will also enable the building of restrooms that are handicapped accessible and will allow for up to four buildings to be retrofitted with a sprinkler system for fire protection. Ultimately, these improvements will result in the North St. Louis County Fairgrounds to become a statewide equestrian showplace.

For nearly a century, the North St. Louis County Fairgrounds were located in the city of Hibbing, which is seven miles from the present day fairground

location in Chisholm. In the late 1980s, the county board agreed to sell their old fairground site to the state of Minnesota (MnSCU), to allow Hibbing Community College room for expansion. The state and the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board (IRRRB) all promised that they would build a new fairgrounds for the dislocated fair, however, to date this has mostly been a promise that has gone unfulfilled. Although the IRRRB did assist with securing the land and site for the new fairgrounds, that was the extent of most of their assistance. The fair board held bake sales, and begged the county board and drained their budget reserves, simply so that a minimal number of pole barns and other fair buildings could be constructed to once again play host for the County Fair. As to having running water and sewer on the site, once again the state and IRRRB left the fair board, high and dry.

Today, after nearly ten years of struggle and hardship, the fair board has managed to bring the facility at least somewhat close to the first class fairgrounds which they had previously enjoyed. In fact, the site has managed to gradually be turned into a nearly year round entertainment, cultural and sporting complex. Each year thousands of trailer campers descend on the facility to enjoy northern Minnesota's cooler summers. Equestrian riders come from all over the state and upper Midwest to enjoy several major horse shows. Finally, being adjacent to the Ironworld Discovery Center means that certain synergies are achieved, especially when both venues are hosting events.

In conclusion, this bonding request will allow the relocated fairgrounds to finally realize its full potential and its destiny as a first class-statewide-equestrian venue. Something as basic as having running water and indoor toilet facilities is not something which only is attractive to humans, but also is something which horses (and their owners) and all the variety of other farm animals that grace a county fair expect to be able to have access to when they are entered into the Big Show in hopes of winning that red, white or blue ribbon.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$1.8 million. \$900,000 will be contributed from a variety of sources, including the St. Louis County Fair Board, IRRRB, the Ironworld Discovery Center, and the city of Chisholm.

St Louis County: Two Projects

Other Considerations

St. Louis County will own the facility and it will be operated by the North St. Louis County Fairboard

Project Contact Person

Gary Cervenik
7226 Sand Lake Road
Britt, Minnesota 55710
Phone: (218) 749-0520
Email c/o Bob.Manzoline@ironworld.com

Priority 2: Midway Park Sanitary Sewer

This request is for \$600,000 in state funding to reconstruct the failing sanitary sewer system in the Midway Park area of Midway Township, located west of the city of Proctor in south St. Louis County.

The Midway Park Sanitary Sewer Project is for the replacement of St. Louis County Sanitary Sewer District No. 1. This sanitary sewer system is used by the residents of the Midway Park area of Midway Township. The project consists of constructing approximately 20 new manholes and 4,800 linear feet of gravity sewer main for the replacement of the existing sanitary sewer. The project also consists of 7,700 linear feet of roadway restoration and reconstruction.

St. Louis County Sanitary Sewer District No. 1 was the result of special legislation in 1937 that allowed St. Louis County to be petitioned to construct the original system which was built in 1938. This system collects the effluent of 93 users in a gravity system and discharges to the Western Lake Superior Sanitation District (WLSSD) in Duluth, Minnesota. The system is currently 69 years old and has used up its serviceable life.

In the 1990s concerns were raised regarding stormwater inflow and infiltration (I&I) from the spring snow melt and rain events causing large sewage flows for WLSSD to contend with in the Duluth area. In response to this, St. Louis County prepared an I&I reduction plan in 1998. This plan involved hiring a consultant to perform a condition survey of the system and the homes serviced by the system. The survey confirmed that the system is

in very poor condition and in need of replacement. Flow meter tests showed that during one particular rain event, the system was discharging three times the volume of water recorded by the water meters of the serviced homes. As a result of this information, the county began an I & I abatement program aimed at eliminating the amount of I&I in the system produced as a result of storm water connections (such as sump pumps) from the serviced homes. With these connections now eliminated, the remaining I & I leaching into the system can only be reduced significantly by the reconstruction of the manholes and mainlines of the system.

The replacement of the system will be of regional significance by helping to protect the water quality of Lake Superior by reducing the I & I problems associated with WLSSD and help reduce the amount of direct sewage overflows bypassing the treatment facility. Also, this will allow for better treatment of the current inflow of the system, also reducing negative environmental impacts.

Midway Township has agreed to assume ownership of the system in conjunction with its reconstruction. St. Louis County has agreed to pay for the reconstruction of all of the affected county state aid roads and county roads in the project and to pay for the design, provide project management and construction inspection.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total project cost is \$2.4 million. St. Louis County will contribute \$900,000 and the town of Midway will contribute \$900,000 to the project.

Other Considerations

The town of Midway will own and operate the facility.

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Narrative

St Louis County: Two Projects

Project Contact Person

Matthew W. Hemmila, P.E. 4787 Midway Road Duluth, Minnesota 55811

Phone: (218) 625-3875 Fax: (218) 625-3888

Email: hemmilam@co.st-louis.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

St Louis County: Two Projects

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | Priority 1: 50% of project costs are to be provided from local |
| | government funds. |
| | Priority 2: 75% of project costs are to be provided from local |
| | government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: Providing wastewater treatment is an important |
| | state mission in Minnesota. However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| ٥. | Priorities 1 and 2: These projects are viewed as having primarily a |
| | local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | Priority 1: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding |
| | for similar projects. |
| | Priority 2: The number of this type of local request suggests that |
| | additional requests will be forthcoming from local units of government |
| 7 | if the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| 8. | Priorities 1 and 2: Not significantly. Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| 0. | Priority 1: Yes; the St. Louis County Board adopted a resolution of |
| | support for the project on June 12, 2007. |
| | Priority 2: Not yet received. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| - | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: A project predesign is not required for projects |
| | consisting of sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater |
| | facilities. |

St Louis Park: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$19,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (St Louis Park)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of St Louis Park, in Hennepin County

Project At A Glance

The city of St. Louis Park requests state funding for two projects (listed in priority order:

- ♦ \$9 million in state funding to assist in the reconstruction of the intersection at Trunk Highway (TH) 7 and Wooddale Avenue.
- ♦ \$10 million for St. Louis Park's estimated share of development, design and construction costs associated with the TH100 Full Build Project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Grade Separated Crossing at Minnesota State Highway 7 and Wooddale Avenue

This request is for \$9 million in state funding to design and reconstruct an atgrade intersection of Highway 7 and Wooddale Avenue in St. Louis Park to a grade separated intersection.

Currently, the capacity and safety of this at-grade signalized intersection could be characterized as poor at best. Based on a recent traffic analysis, this intersection is currently operating at a modeled level of service D, but due to rail, trail, and emergency vehicle preemption impacts the actual level of service varies between E and F. Our analysis also indicates this situation will worsen to a projected level of service E-F by 2030, not considering the rail, trail, or preemption impacts. Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) staff have identified significant safety (crash) concerns in this

corridor (Highway 7 from Highway 169 to Highway 100) with the east half of the corridor of particular concern.

This intersection is utilized frequently on a daily basis by our Fire Department to respond to calls for service (Station No. 1 is located just to the south). Pedestrians and bicyclists currently use this intersection to access mass transit, the regional trail system, the community center, and the high school. In addition, significant traffic as a result of redevelopment and from an adjacent industrial/commercial complex to the south also uses this intersection as a major access point.

This project is of both local and regional significance. This project will allow for the separation of regional and local traffic, which will vastly improve the regional transportation systems. The regional systems alluded to are Highway 7, the Southwest Light Rail Transit (LRT) Regional Trail immediately to the south, and the proposed future dedicated bus way or LRT system. Currently, as part of Hennepin County's Southwest Corridor transit study, a transit station is proposed adjacent to the intersection of Highway 7 and Wooddale. Without this intersection improvement project, these other regional systems will likely not be possible or the operation of existing ones will continue to worsen due to congestion and safety concerns. In addition, future anticipated renewal and redevelopment in the area will be stifled. Reconstruction of this intersection to a grade separated intersection is the only practical long term solution to this infrastructure problem.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of this project is \$14.586 million. St. Louis Park has dedicated over \$3 million in local dollars, which have already been expended to acquire right-of-way in anticipation of this project. This project was rated highly during by the Metropolitan Council's Transit Advisory Board and was awarded \$5.885 million in STP funding, 2006.

Other Considerations

Construction is expected to begin in 2009 and will last two years. Our federal match funds are available through 2010.

Joint ownership between the city of St. Louis Park and the MnDOT.

St Louis Park: Two Projects

Project Contact Person

Michael P. Rardin, P.E. Public Works Director City of St. Louis Park 5005 Minnetonka Boulevard St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55416

Phone: (952) 924-2551 Fax: (952) 924-2663

Email: mrardin@stlouispark.org

Priority 2: TH 100 Full Build Project

The city of St. Louis Park is requesting \$10 million to cover its estimated share of development, design, and construction costs associated with the TH 100 Full Build Project which has a possible 2009 bid letting and a scheduled proposed 2014 construction date no later than 2015 (or sooner via motor vehicle sales tax [MVST] monies).

MnDOT completed construction of the TH 100 interim project in 2006, which provided a third lane in each direction through St. Louis Park. MnDOT is in the final design phase of the geometric layout determination for this project and the full build is scheduled for bid letting no later than 2014. The full build project is on MnDOT's advanced design list, so with the passage of the MVST amendment, it could be let as early as 2009. The project will cost approximately \$150 million, of which St. Louis Park may be expected to contribute up to an estimated \$10 million. The city will need assistance to fund its expected share of this project of regional significance.

MnDOT spoke to the council in March 2006 and while they would not make a written commitment, MnDOT reassured the city that the construction of the interim project would not delay the full build project. The interim project added a third lane in each direction by decreasing lane widths from 12 feet to 11 feet and eliminating or severely reducing shoulders along that stretch of highway. The third lane is required for the full build project so that MnDOT can keep a minimum of two lanes open in each direction during construction.

Improvements not included as a part of the interim project include construction of the noise walls, which MnDOT agreed to construct no later than 2015, width expansion of lanes, construction of on/off ramps, and bridge and storm water improvements. Bridges spanning TH 100 at Highway 7 and Highway 5, and storm sewer conveyance systems have no more than 10-15 years of useful life left and are deteriorating. In addition, there are approximately 50-60 residents who live in uncertainty because their homes (22 properties) are within the future right-of-way of the new project.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

MnDOT completed the temporary fix in this stretch of TH 100 with the commitment to the city council that the temporary fix would not delay the proposed 2014 construction date for the full build project (bridge repair, lane widening, surface reconstruction, right-of-way acquisition, etc.)

Other Considerations

The construction schedule will be determined by MnDOT and construction could start anywhere from May 2010 to May 2015 with completion expected within two years. There will be joint ownership between the city of St. Louis Park and MnDOT for the completed project.

Project Contact Person

Michael P. Rardin, P.E.
Public Works Director
City of St. Louis Park
5005 Minnetonka Boulevard
St. Louis Park, Minnesota 55416

Phone: (952) 924-2551 Fax: (952) 924-2663

Email: mrardin@stlouispark.org

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

St Louis Park: Two Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 38% of 2008 project costs are provided from non-state | |
| | funding sources. | |
| | Priority 2: \$10 million (7%) of the estimated \$150 million cost of the | |
| | Trunk Highway upgrade are expected to be the local responsibility; | |
| | the \$10 million is requested from the state in this proposal. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priority 1: Transportation is an important state mission. In the | |
| | metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are | |
| | responsible for transportation planning and programming and | |
| | prioritizing state and federal funding for transportation projects. | |
| | Priority 2: Transportation is an important state mission. In the | |
| | metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are | |
| | responsible for transportation planning and programming and | |
| | prioritizing state funding for transportation projects. Mn/DOT has | |
| | existing policies regarding local cost participation for Trunk Highway | |
| | projects. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | Priority 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local or | |
| | regional benefit. | |
| | Priority 2: This project is viewed as having primarily a regional | |
| | benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | Priority 1: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding | |
| | for similar Trunk Highway projects. | |
| | Priority 2: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding | |
| | for similar local cost shares of Trunk Highway projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the St. Louis Park City Council adopted a resolution of support | |
| | for each of the projects on July 16, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |

Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?
 No, project predesigns are not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways.

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$47,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of St Paul)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of St Paul, in Ramsey County

Project At A Glance

The city of St. Paul requests funding for four projects (in priority order):

- ♦ \$11 million for Phase II of the Como Zoo Polar Bear and Gorilla Exhibit Renovation project
- \$25 million for a new SPORTS initiative to construct new and renovate existing sports and recreation facilities in St. Paul, including Midway Stadium. One aim of the SPORTS initiative is to increase the number of soccer facilities in the city.
- ♦ \$6 million for acquisition, master plan preparation, pre-design and design of the National Great River Park, including the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary.
- \$5 million to construct, furnish and equip an Asian Pacific Cultural Center on the east side of St. Paul

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Phase II Como Zoo Polar Bear and Gorilla Exhibit Renovation

This request is for \$11 million in state funding to pre-design, design, construct, furnish and equip renovated gorilla and polar bear exhibits at Como Zoo. Como Zoo is operated by the city of Saint Paul and is located in Como Regional Park. Como Zoo has animals that people want to see, with its collections including nine of top 10 zoo animals based on a recent Harris interactive survey. The polar bear and gorilla, two of Como Zoo's signature animals, rank number two and number one in the survey respectively.

Como Zoo has significant statewide significance. Como Park Zoo and Conservatory host 1.7 million visitors annually, making it one of the state's top family destinations. Only 20 percent of visitors to Como are Saint Paul residents, and over 15 percent of visitors arrive at Como from outside of the metropolitan area.

Previous Zoo renovations were completed during the 1970s and 1980s. Over the past 25 years exhibit standards and animal care practices have changed dramatically. In order to maintain an industry accredited and viable zoo, exhibits must be brought up to date to ensure the health and vitality of the animals. The improved exhibits also create unique educational opportunities that will inspire visitors' appreciation of the natural world.

The new gorilla habitat will expand the existing inadequate exhibit into more natural habitats for the animals. The improvements will result in larger spaces, properly aligned viewing areas, and increased opportunities for the gorillas to exhibit natural behaviors. The project will also expand the indoor environments of the gorillas which will allow for advancement related to their training programs and general standard of care.

The existing polar bear environment is inadequate to exhibit bears from animal care, zookeeper and visitor perspectives. The new habitat will meet industry standards and allow the bears to experience behaviors including swimming, diving, digging and hiding. The new exhibit will also allow for the future establishment of a family group. Conservation is an increasingly important issue related to the preservation of the polar bear species as changes to their natural habitats attributed to global climate change have led to decreases in overall populations, cub survival and bear weights.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total project cost of the Phase I and II projects to renovate the Polar Bear and Gorilla Exhibits is \$28.2 million. This state bonding request for \$11 million, when added to the \$9 million bonding appropriation from 2006, is expected to leverage \$8.2 million in private donations.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

In 2006, \$9 million was appropriated in the bonding bill (Laws 2006, Chapter 258), allowing work to begin on the Polar Bear phase of the project. At the time of the 2006 appropriation, it was anticipated that a 2008 bonding request would be both necessary and forthcoming as a second phase. Additionally, the 2006 appropriation was \$1 million short of the \$10 million bonding request. The 2008 request of \$11 million is consistent with the above and in combination with private fundraising efforts to complete these most immediate renovation needs identified in the Como Campus Master Plan.

Other Considerations

The city of Saint Paul, Division of Parks and Recreation will own and operate the facility.

The Polar Bear project has proceeded through design development and has incorporated strategies to meet the requirements established by the *State of Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines*. As conservation is essential to the mission of Como Park Zoo and Conservatory, it is critical to us that we act responsibly and as leaders related to these issues. Some of the aspects of the project planning included:

- Integration of requirements into the design process by entire design team, full conformance with all version 2.0 required guidelines.
- Submission to Xcel Energy's design assistance plan process

As the Gorilla project proceeds through subsequent design phases, it is anticipated that the same strategies will be applied.

Priority 1 Project Contact Person:

Michael Hahm Wendy Underwood
Como Campus Manager Legislative Liaison
Saint Paul Division of Parks and Office of the Mayor

Recreation 390 City Hall

 25 West 4th Street, Suite 300
 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102

 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102
 Office: (651) 206-8847

 Office: (651) 487-8296
 Mobile: (651) 206-8847

 Mobile: (651) 248-0629
 Fax: (651) 266-8513

Fax (651) 487-8255 Email:

Email: wendy.underwood@ci.stpaul.mn.us

michael.hahm@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Priority 2: St Paul Outdoor Recreation and Team Sports (SPORTS) Initiative

This request is for \$25 million in state funding for design, construction, renovation, furnishing and equipping sports and recreation facilities in the city of Saint Paul.

The SPORTS Initiative is recognition of Saint Paul's role as the state's home for amateur sports and active recreation. From the largest Hmong soccer tournament in the country to high school state tournaments, people from across Minnesota and beyond gather in their capital city for youth and amateur sporting events throughout the year. Saint Paul strives for family friendly environments to foster audiences and participants in accessing authentic sports experiences. The SPORTS Initiative will bring a level of investment in civic facilities worthy of Minnesota.

Midway Stadium, home of the Saint Paul Saints, the High School State Baseball Tournament, the Hamline University Baseball Team, and countless youth and amateur baseball games, will soon reach 30 years old. The facility is simply outdated, not for lack of amenities, but rather for lack of facilities. Families who attend games at Midway may miss several innings if they have to use a restroom. The Gopher baseball team prefers to play in a sparsely filled Metrodome rather than nearby Midway because of its deficient facilities. In the meantime, baseball programs continue to grow, and the regional need for up-to-date facilities exceeds the supply. Midway Stadium is the

neighborhood ballpark for the entire state; an investment in basic infrastructure will ensure that Minnesota has a fun, authentic, and affordable opportunity for families in the 21st Century.

The SPORTS Initiative also addresses the burgeoning need for the fastest growing sport in America, soccer. Youth from all over the area scramble to find soccer fields for practice and competition, and no place for soccer audiences. Throughout the spring, summer, and fall, soccer practices are happening between softball games, avoiding the infield or ignoring football yard markers. New Americans celebrate the game of soccer with large tournaments every year, bringing thousands of tourists. Additionally, as the sport of soccer grows, there will be more economic opportunity if we can create a true soccer experience for fans of the Minnesota Thunder and other exhibition games rather than playing on the football field of Saint Paul Central High School.

Currently, the city of Saint Paul is considering construction of a soccer facility with practice and competition fields adjacent to Midway Stadium on Energy Park Drive. The city owns this land, and it would require some relocation expenses. The city is also working with interested investors who may donate land for a soccer facility. The determination will be made in 2007.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the SPORTS Initiative project is \$35 million. In addition to the \$25 million requested from the state, the city is contributing land, as well as management and operations of the facilities. Land value is estimated at \$5.9 million.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. Annual operations and maintenance costs absorbed by the city are approximately \$450,000 a year currently for Midway Stadium. An additional soccer facility would raise the overall operations and maintenance costs for Midway Stadium and soccer facilities to \$650,000 annually.

Other Considerations

The city of Saint Paul is committed to sustainable building design that meets or exceeds Minnesota statute. As a locally owned and operated facility geared towards youth and families, it is in the city's best interests to build baseball and soccer facilities that are highly efficient and are healthy environments. As design for the facilities moves forward the sustainable quidelines established by Minnesota statute be a minimum requirement. Also, new and renovated municipal buildings within the city are required to meet standards established in a sustainable development policy as passed by the city in January 2007.

Priority 2 Project Contact Person:

Joe Spencer, Project Manager Wendy Underwood Office of the Mayor Suite 390, City Hall

Saint Paul. Minnesota 55102 (651) 266-8524 Office:

Mobile: (651) 503-3040 Email:

ioe.spencer@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Legislative Liaison Office of the Mayor 390 City Hall

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102 Office: (651) 206-8847 Mobile: (651) 206-8847 Fax: (651) 266-8513

Email:

wendy.underwood@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Priority 3: National Great River Park, including the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary

This request is for \$6 million in state funding for acquisition, master plan preparation, pre-design, and design. The acquisition includes approximately 2.5 acres of land adjacent to the newly created Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary and 1.5 acres of land in the Lilydale Regional Park. Acquisition of these properties will save valuable land currently in jeopardy of private sector development and incompatible uses. The acquisition adjacent to the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary will provide land for the proposed Bruce Vento Interpretive Center, a place for children, families, and adults to learn about the ecology of the Mississippi River and its value as habitat for nearly half of the North America continent's migrating birds and waterfowl. Interpretation of the land's cultural resources will also allow visitors to learn about the American Indian history of the area, from the ancient Hopewell culture that built mounds high above the river to the Dakota tribes who used the land on the floodplain as an important meeting place for trade and ceremony.

The acquisition and pre-design of the Lilydale lands is critical. The current property is incompatible to park uses and is a visual blight on the landscape at the main entry area into one of the region's largest and most diverse natural areas. Lilydale Park includes a fossil area, 100-acre lake, wetlands and wooded areas that provide habitat for a huge variety of water fowl, mammals and vegetation, and all within a short walk from our capital city downtown. The creation of an entrance, trailhead and park operation facility is needed at a very restricted location and key juncture between the 60-acre Harriet Island site and the 215-acre Lilydale Regional Park. Pre-design and design of the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary Interpretive Center and Lilydale Regional Park trail head/ entrance will determine how to best proceed to meet the needs of the current community and future generations to come.

In addition to acquisition and pre-design, the creation of a National Great River Park Master Plan is critical to set a long term vision for Saint Paul's 26 miles of riverfront. The plan will determine appropriate uses along the river, improve access, usage, health and safety for over 3.2 million current annual visits to the Great River Park; prepare to serve growing/denser urban population in the future; and develop and support local, regional and national ecotourism throughout the 2,500 acres of public park bordering 26 miles of Mississippi riverfront in Saint Paul.

Priority 3 Total Project Cost: The total project cost for this 2008 phase of Saint Paul's National Great River Park initiative is \$24.54 million. The \$6 million request for state funds is expected to leverage an additional \$18.54 million from city, federal and private sources.

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. The city of Saint Paul will own and operate the facilities.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

\$2.5 million in the 2006 Bonding Bill: National Great River Park received \$2.5 million in 2006 to acquire valuable river bluff land, match a Federal Safety-LU Grant for a trail link over Warner Road to the Mississippi River and to partially match federal TEA 21 grants to renovate the Mississippi riverbank in downtown Saint Paul.

Other Considerations

National Great River Park was included in the 2007 bonding bill at \$3.8 million to match federal TEA 21 grants which are set to expire in September 2007. These grants would be to complete Mississippi riverbank renovations. This request for 2008 does not currently address the loss of federal matching dollars should there be no bonding bill prior to the 2008 legislative session.

Priority 3 Project Contact Person:

Ms. Jody Martinez

Manager, Design and Construction
Saint Paul Parks and Recreation
300 City Hall Annex

Wendy Underwood
Legislative Liaison
Office of the Mayor

25 West 4th Street Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102 Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102 Office: (651) 206-8847 Phone: (651) 292-7405 Fax: (651) 266-8513

Email: Email:

jody.martinez@ci.stpaul.mn.us wendy.underwood@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Priority 4: Asian Pacific Cultural Center

This request is for \$5 million in state funding to construct, furnish and equip an Asian Pacific Cultural Center (APCC) to be located in Ramsey County and the city of Saint Paul.

The Asian Pacific Cultural Center mission is to celebrate, promote and foster understanding of Asian Pacific cultural heritage. The three-fold goal of APCC is to:

- ♦ Educate and provide opportunities to further understanding of Asian Pacific communities and their cultures;
- ◆ Provide space for Asian Pacific community organizations focused on art, film, music, dance, cuisine, and language studies; and
- ♦ Create cultural bridges for intergenerational and inter-ethnic understanding within the state's Asian Pacific communities and among all Minnesotans.

There are no Minnesota organizations similar to APCC. Part of its mandate is to build and maintain good relationships among all Asian Pacific arts and cultural organizations in Minnesota. As such, APCC will not compete with existing agencies but rather will complement and strengthen the region, providing an important resource to individuals, families of adoptive children, educational institutions, and corporations. APCC will garner support from Asian Pacific nonprofit organizations, their constituents, the broader Asian Pacific community and the arts community throughout the Twin Cities and greater Minnesota.

APCC's efforts are directed toward funding and building a new destination place for Minnesotans. The 65,000 square foot Asian Pacific Cultural Center facility will be part of a mixed-use re-development of the former Hamm's Brewery on Minnehaha Avenue in St. Paul. The facility will include a multimedia/resource library, a large banquet hall and kitchen, theater/cinema, an exhibit/gallery space, and multiple classrooms and offices.

Construction of and programming at APCC will lead to an improvement in the lives of Minnesota's Pan-Asian community and all of its residents. Minnesota children will visit the Asian Pacific Cultural Center to learn about the contributions made by Minnesotans of Asian descent to state history and culture. Children of Asian Pacific descent will visit the Center to learn from elders about their heritage. Elders will find a place to meet, socialize and share their memories with a younger generation. Private citizens will find entertainment and education at the Center, while organizations and corporations conducting business will find the Center's offerings an invaluable resource.

It is anticipated that over 100,000 people will pass through the doors of APCC in the first year alone. Using even the most conservative of formulas, APCC will generate \$2 - \$3 million in new revenue.

Priority 4 Total Project Cost: The estimated total cost for APCC's capital project is \$15 million. Approximately half is expected to be secured from a variety of public sources, including this \$5 million request for state bond proceeds.

The other half is expected to be raised from foundations, corporations, and individuals. A Capital Campaign Committee consisting of 20 members—

recruited expressly to represent Minnesota's diverse community and interests—is identifying and approaching corporate, foundation and individual prospects for the capital campaign.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This project received \$400,000 in the 2006 Bonding Bill for predesign and design.

Other Considerations

APCC is committed to constructing a sustainable facility, as required by Minnesota statute. As such, APCC has included sustainable design experience as a criterion in the architect selection process. Each of the four finalists in the architect selection process have LEED accredited professionals on staff. Two design tools, Building Better Buildings or B3, developed for the state of Minnesota, and the *Minnesota Sustainable Design Guidelines*, developed by the University of Minnesota, will also be used as tools for evaluating green design options.

Priority 4 Project Contact Person:

Ms. Naomi Chu, Executive Director

Asian Pacific Cultural Center

P.O. Box 4097

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104

Phone: (612) 282-1915 Fax: (651) 646-3386

Email: nchu@apccmn.org

Wendy Underwood Legislative Liaison Office of the Mayor

390 City Hall

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55102 Office: (651) 206-8847

Mobile: (651) 206-8847 Fax: (651) 266-8513

Email:

wendy.underwood@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Grants to Political Subdivisions Project Scoring

St Paul: Four Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 29% of project costs for both phases together are | |
| | provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| | Priority 2: 29% of project costs are to be provided from non-state | |
| | sources. | |
| | Priority 3: 75% of project costs are provided from non-state sources. Priority 4: 65% of total project costs, including predesign and design, are provided from non-state sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 3: Providing recreational opportunities is an | |
| | important state mission. However, the degree to which these types | |
| | of local projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| | Delegity Or The state selection from the second constant and a secient in | |
| | Priority 2: The state role in funding sports center style projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to another. | |
| | unclear and has varied considerably from one blefinium to another. | |
| | Priority 4: The state role in funding civic center and community | |
| | center style projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one | |
| | biennium to another. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | Priority 1: This project is viewed as having a regional or statewide | |
| | impact. | |
| | Priorities 2, 3 and 4: This project is viewed as having primarily a | |
| | regional impact. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priorities 1,2, 3 and 4: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | Priorities 1,2, 3 and 4: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek | |
| 7 | state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Priorities 1,2,3 and 4: Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the St. Paul City Council adopted a resolution of support for the | |
| 0 | projects on June 20, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? | |
| | | |
| L | Yes. | |

Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted?
 Predesigns have not yet been submitted for the Priority #1, #2 or #4 projects.
 A predesign is not required for the Priority #3 project (the National Great River Park project).

Steele County: Minnesota Wildlife Art Gallery

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,254,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Steele County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Gainey Conference Center, Owatonna Township

Project At A Glance

Steele County requests \$1.254 million to cover 50 percent of the cost of a new Wildlife Art Gallery, to be established at the University of St. Thomas's Gainey Conference Center near Owatonna.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1,254,000 in state funding to predesign, design, construct and furnish a wildlife art gallery near Owatonna in Steele County.

Steele County and the University of St. Thomas propose to establish the gallery at the university's Daniel C. Gainey Conference Center. The gallery would recognize the significant contributions that wildlife artists from Owatonna and throughout Minnesota have made to this popular art form, which celebrates Minnesotan's love for the outdoors and their respect for nature and the environment. No other such gallery or initiative exists in Minnesota to honor the role that these artists have played in advancing wildlife art.

Original works and limited edition prints would be on permanent and rotating displays in the gallery. Other possible endeavors could include a history of wildlife art and an annual tribute to an artist with a retrospective of his or her work, a lecture and a workshop to attract budding artists, including college and high school students from the region.

Artists from the Owatonna area have been at the forefront of the American wildlife art movement over the last half-century. Many of them, including two-time federal duck stamp winner David Maas, Jim Killen and Stu Ferreira, started their careers as commercial artists at Jostens in Owatonna. Other influential figures were Barney Anderson and Charles Pearson, Owatonna High School art teachers who mentored students, including the sister duo of Rosemary Millette and Theresa Marschel.

Jostens evolved into a national leader in the production of class rings, yearbooks and diplomas under longtime chief executive officer Daniel C. Gainey, was also was an avid outdoorsman and raised world champion Arabian horses on the outskirts of Owatonna. Gainey bequeathed his 180-acre farm to St. Thomas, which has run the Gainey Conference Center on the site since 1992.

The gallery would attract wildlife art devotees as well as casual visitors from throughout the Upper Midwest. Among the consultants assisting with the project is William B. Webster, a Minnesota businessman who pioneered the practice of offering artists' original paintings in signed and numbered limited edition lithographs. Webster founded Wild Wings Gallery and later sold it to Cabela's, the giant outfitter, which has a large store in Owatonna.

"If one were to trace back to the who, what, where and when that brought about the explosion of wildlife and sporting art, most would agree that it all began in a somewhat obscure and rather unlikely location centered in the heartland of Minnesota's farming community," Webster has said. "Clearly no other community in the United States did more to foster the growth and acceptance of this genre of art than Owatonna through the great works of its 'painters of the prairie."

This project will attempt to meet the standards set forth in LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Guidelines for LEED-NC. These guidelines set sustainability standards for building owners and design teams addressing new building design and construction, as well as major renovation projects. The project team will utilize many elements to achieve sustainability levels that meet or exceed the guidelines established in state statute.

Steele County: Minnesota Wildlife Art Gallery

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this project is \$2.508 million. Non-state sources would provide \$1.254 million. (The project cost does not include costs to acquire pieces of wildlife art for the gallery. Planners have yet to determine the art that will be in the gallery, including how many pieces would be on permanent display and temporary display.)

Impact on Agency Operating Budgets (Facilities Notes)

None. St. Thomas will raise funds to cover operating costs.

Other Considerations

The gallery would be owned by Steele County, which would serve as the project's legal sponsor. St. Thomas would enter in to a ground lease of the gallery parcel at the Gainey Center to Steele County, which would then enter into an operating lease with the university to operate the gallery.

Project Contact Person

Dan Severson County Coordinator

Steele County Administration Center

630 Florence Ave.

Owatonna, Minnesota 55060 Phone: (507) 444-7431 Fax: (507) 444-7470

dave.severson@co.steele.mn.us

Doug Hennes

Vice President for University and

Government Relations University of St. Thomas

2115 Summit Ave, Mail No. LOR-508

St. Paul, Minnesota 55105 Phone: (651) 962-6402 Fax: (651) 962-6410 dehennes@stthomas.edu

Governor's Recommendations

Steele County: Minnesota Wildlife Art Gallery

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs to design and construct the art gallery are to be |
| | provided from non-state funding sources. (Note: The cost of |
| | acquiring art pieces is not included in the current project budget.) |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. Funds will be raised to cover operating costs. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | See #2 above. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar |
| | projects. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | The art gellery project is a unique request, without comparison to |
| | other submitted local capital funding requests. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes, the Steele County Board adopted a resolution of support on |
| | September 25, 2007 |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | Not yet submitted. |
| | , |

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,755,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Thief River Falls)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Thief River Falls, in Pennington County

Project At A Glance

The city of Thief River Falls is requesting state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$2.415 million for an aquatic center preliminarily designed as Phase II of the city of Thief River Falls' Multi-Events Center (MEC).
- ♦ \$340,000 for a Pedestrian and Bicycle Pathways System Phase I

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Phase II of the Thief River Falls' Multi-Events Center (MEC)

This request is for \$2.415 million in state funding to construct, furnish and equip an aquatic center preliminarily designed as Phase II of the city of Thief River Falls' Multi-Events Center (MEC).

The city of Thief River Falls has many significant needs for quality of life enhancements in order to continue to attract employees to fill the many additional positions being produced annually by our largest employers. As one interviewee stated when the MEC was first conceived, "The quality of life and interest in the community is one of the primary reasons that Thief River Falls and its citizens see themselves as leaders in the region – still the best that Minnesota has to offer." Although we realize that we may never be able to afford the multitude of amenities available in metropolitan areas, we do need to augment our vast natural resources with the projects we are submitting for consideration as a 2008 Capital Appropriation.

Recognizing that a vigorous, growing population is necessary for a community's economic health, in 1987 the city formed a task force to identify needs within the city. The result was a three-phase, regional MEC to serve Thief River Falls and the northwestern Minnesota region. Phase I was partially funded by the state with \$3.15 million in funding. Contributions of cash and in-kind support were made by the four entities which formed a joint powers board to oversee and administer the facility (city of Thief River Falls, Pennington County, School District #564 and Northland Community and Technical College) which currently includes softball and baseball fields, a football stadium, soccer fields, and a running track.

The economic well-being of the city of Thief River Falls directly impacts the economic well-being of the smaller communities within a 35 mile radius of Thief River Falls. These smaller communities house many of the people employed at two international companies headquartered in Thief River Falls – Arctic Cat and Digi-Key. These two companies employ over 3,500 people. If they are unable to attract employees to this area, then all of northwestern Minnesota will suffer.

Phase II of the MEC project addresses the lack of a recreational, public swimming pool. Although the school district has a swimming pool attached to the middle school and opens it up for public swimming when it is not in use by the school district, it is in dire need of systems repair and major renovation due to the inadequate depth for diving. The aquatic center envisioned in Phase II of the MEC would include a six-lane lap pool, large water slide, diving area, zero-depth area with a water umbrella, spa and connected to an outdoor seasonal sun deck, recreational area and wading pool.

The tax capacity for the city of Thief River Falls ranks 49th out of the 50 Minnesota cities with a population of 5,000-10,000. Without assistance from the state of Minnesota, we will be unable to provide these quality of life enhancements in our city which are necessary to continue to attract quality employees and their families not only to Thief River Falls but to the entire northwestern region.

Although the design of this facility pre-dates M.S. 165.35 and compliance for buildings built after 2004, the city has taken a leadership role in promoting sustainable buildings. In fact, in 2003 the city was given a generous \$11 million hockey arena which did not include many of the elements of a

sustainable building as enumerated in Minnesota statute. Since receiving that gift, the city has installed several systems to save energy and is exploring new lighting and other ways to reduce the long-term operating costs of the building.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the aquatic center project is \$2.69 million. In addition to the requested state funds, \$275,000 in nonstate funds (city - \$ 70,000 and private - \$ 205,000) will be contributed towards the project.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

This is Phase II of a three phase Joint Powers project that received a total of \$3.16 million from the state: \$3 million in state funding in 1998; \$150,000 in 1999 from the Department of Natural Resources; and \$10,000 from the Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission in 2000.

Other Considerations

The facility will be owned by the city of Thief River Falls and operated by the MEC Joint Powers Board which was established in 1995 and currently oversees other MEC facilities located at Northland Community and Technical College.

Project Contact Person

Madelyn Vigen, Parks and Recreation Director 525 Brooks Avenue South P.O. Box 528

Thief River Falls, Minnesota 56701

Phone: (218) 681-2519 Fax: (218) 681-7246 Email: mvigen@citytrf.net

Priority 2: Pedestrian and Bicycle Pathways System - Phase I

This request is for \$340,000 in state funding to design and construct Phase I of a pedestrian and bicycle pathway system for Thief River Falls.

The city of Thief River Falls has many significant needs for quality of life enhancements in order to continue to attract employees to fill the many additional positions being produced annually by our largest employers. As one interviewee stated when the MEC was first conceived, "The quality of life and interest in the community is one of the primary reasons that Thief River Falls and its citizens see themselves as leaders in the region – still the best that Minnesota has to offer." Although we realize that we may never be able to afford the multitude of amenities available in metropolitan areas, we do need to augment our vast natural resources with the projects we are submitting for consideration as a 2008 Capital Appropriation.

As part of our comprehensive plan which was just completed this year, the importance of pedestrian and bicycle pathways received considerable attention. As a region that grew up with automobiles, the challenge that faces the city is how to improve the availability of safe, attractive, alternative transportation modes such as cycling and walking.

Our children do not currently have bicycle pathways to or from area schools, recreational areas, or even from one residential area to another. Adults do not have safe pathways for recreational use or to get from residences to businesses.

The city does have right-of-ways for the areas proposed as a pathway. The design incorporated in our city's comprehensive plan is for a cloverleaf of pathways connecting the quadrants of the city to the city's center and taking advantage of the beauty afforded by the Red Lake River and Thief River which flow through our city. This request is for Phase I which will connect the Ralph Engelstad Arena, Arctic Cat, and Digi-Key to the city's existing Riverwalk pedestrian walkway and then to the Northland Community and Technical College and the MEC. (A map of the proposed pathway system has been submitted to the Department of Finance.)

The economic well-being of the city of Thief River Falls directly impacts the economic well-being of the smaller communities within a 35 mile radius of Thief River Falls. These smaller communities house many of the people employed at two international companies headquartered in Thief River Falls – Arctic Cat and Digi-Key. These two companies employ over 3,500 people. If they are unable to attract employees to this area, then all of northwestern Minnesota will suffer.

The tax capacity for the city of Thief River Falls ranks 49th out of the 50 Minnesota cities with a population of 5,000-10,000. Without assistance from the state of Minnesota, we will be unable to provide these quality of life enhancements in our city which are necessary to continue to attract quality employees and their families not only to Thief River Falls but to the entire northwestern region.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the pedestrian and bicycle path system project is \$390,000. The city will provide \$50,000 in in-kind contributions for the project.

Other Considerations

If funding is received from the state in the 2008 bonding bill, construction would begin May 2009 with an anticipated completion date of October 2009. The pathway system will be owned and maintained by the City of Thief River Falls.

Project Contact Person

Ron Lindberg, Public Works Director 405 Third Street East P.O. Box 528 Thief River Falls, Minnesota 56701

Phone: (218) 681-8506 Fax: (218) 681-8507 Email: rlindberg@citytrf.net

Governor's Recommendations

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | Priority 1: 10% of project costs are to be provided from local | |
| | government funds. | |
| | Priority 2: 12% of project costs are to be provided from in-kind local | |
| | government contributions. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Priority 1: The state role in funding community center style projects is unclear and has varied considerably from one biennium to another. | |
| | Priority 2: Providing recreational opportunities is an important state | |
| | mission. The degree to which these types of project should be | |
| | funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| ٥. | Priority 1: This project is viewed as having primarily a local or | |
| | regional benefit. | |
| | Priority 2: This project is viewed as having primarily a local impact. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | Priorities 1 and 2: If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state | |
| 7 | funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| 0. | Yes; the Thief River Falls City Council adopted a resolution of | |
| | support on June 19, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| _ | requesting? | |
| | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A predesign for Priority #1, the conference center, has not yet been | |
| | submitted. | |
| | A predesign is not required for Priority #2 a project predesign is not | |
| | required for projects consisting of roads, bridges, trails or pathways. | |

Two Harbors: Water Treatment Plant Capacity increase

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$2,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Two Harbors)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Two Harbors, in Lake County

Project At A Glance

Two Harbors is requesting \$2 million in state funding for engineering services and for the purchase and construction of a 1.25 MG elevated water tank, the upgrade of two pump stations, and the purchase of water meters for the purpose of water conservation to increase the capacity of the existing water treatment plant.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$2 million in state funding for engineering services and for the purchase and construction of a 1.25 MG elevated water tank, the upgrade of two pump stations, and the purchase of water meters for the purpose of water conservation to increase the capacity of the existing water treatment plant. The elevated water tank will be located on city owned land in the Lake County Industrial Park. The remaining improvements will be located within the corporate limits of the city of Two Harbors.

The project has both local and regional significance, with the potential for larger geographical significance as well. The construction of the new elevated water tank will accomplish a number of city goals.

First, it will replace an aging 1 MG water tank that is in need of repair and also needs to be repainted. The old tank is covered in lead-based paint and is located in a residential neighborhood, thus making it very expensive to encapsulate and re-paint the structure.

Second, the new tank would be located in an area that would not only provide additional capacity to the county's industrial park and the school district's new high school facility, but would also provide increased water pressure to adequately service their fire sprinkler systems as well. The businesses in the Industrial Park and the School District provide jobs not only for residents of the city of Two Harbors, but for a large portion of northeastern Minnesota, the Duluth Area, and Superior, Wisconsin.

Third, the construction of the new tank would take a huge burden off of the city's 100,000 gallon water tank, which is currently being over-utilized and places the city at risk for fire protection during the high water consumption months of June through August.

Fourth, the new tank will help meet the need of an adequate water supply for new economic development. The city is currently working with a developer from the Brainerd area, and two separate developers from Roseville, Minnesota, on economic development projects within the city limits. These projects provide a statewide significance.

Total Project Cost

The total project cost for all funding sources is \$4 million. Non-state funds to be contributed to the project are: Federal = \$1 million; and city = \$1 million.

Other Considerations

The city of Two Harbors will both own and operate the facility. The city intends to begin certain phases of the project in June, 2008, with completion of the elevated tank by 9-1-09.

Project Contact Person

Lee A. Klein, City Administrator 522 First Avenue Two Harbors, Minnesota 55616

Phone: (218) 834-5631 Fax: (218) 834-2674

Email: Ikleintharbors@frontiernet.net

Grants to Political Subdivisions

Project Narrative

Two Harbors: Water Treatment Plant Capacity increase

Governor's Recommendations

Two Harbors: Water Treatment Plant Capacity increase

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 4 | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of project costs are expected to be provided from local and | |
| | federal government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. No. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Two Harbors City Council adopted a resolution of support | |
| | on June 25, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, | |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| | 1 opparation projects, or water and wastewater radiities. | |

Upper Sioux Community: Water System Improvement

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$775,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Upper Sioux Community)

PROJECT LOCATION: outside Granite Falls, in Yellow Medicine County

Project At A Glance

This request is for \$775,000 in state funding to assist in the construction of a water system improvement project on the Upper Sioux Community reservation, located outside Granite Falls, Yellow Medicine County.

The complete submission from the Upper Sioux Community is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$775,000 in state funding to assist in the construction of a water system improvement project on the Upper Sioux Community (USC) reservation, located outside Granite Falls, Yellow Medicine County. This would include installation of the USC water system improvement project through the appropriation. A recent report by the Indian Health Service outlines two problems: continuity of service and increase in water demand.

Continuity of Service. The current water supply for the community water system is located at one extreme of the distribution line. Usually, there is redundancy in a water system by means of distribution loops of multiple sources. Since the Upper Sioux system was developed over time in a linear course, the entire distribution system is critical. Any interruption in the water main due to testing, maintenance, repair, or equipment failure will result in a disruption of water service to parts of the system. Depending on where that interruption occurs, up to 90 percent of the community could be without water. Therefore, there is an immediate need to provide continuity of service for the system.

- Increase in Water Demand. Current water supply, storage and distribution facilities are capable of serving the existing water demand. However, current facilities are not capable of sustaining future demands forecasted by the Upper Sioux Planning Department. There is a need to increase the water supply and storage facilities to satisfy future water demand.
- A reliable water delivery system is critical for the continued growth of the USC, both for housing and for jobs. The casino and the other tribal businesses make the USC one of the largest, if not the largest employer in the community. There are currently at total of 425 jobs, with healthcare benefits. In 1991, there were fewer than 30 employees.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the water system improvement project is \$3.1 million. Federal funding of \$1.55 million will be used for the project. The USC will also contribute \$775,000 to the project. In addition, the Indian Health Service has already prepared a preliminary planning report. The Indian Health Service will also conduct engineering predesign.

Other Considerations

The USC, a Federally Recognized Indian Community, will own and operate the water system.

[Department of Finance note: State funding assistance for this project would need to be from a source other than general obligation bonds, since the USC is not an agency or political subdivision of the state.]

Project Contact Person

Chairman Kevin Jensvold P.O. Box 147

Granite Falls. Minnesota 56241

Phone: (320) 564-3853 Fax: (320) 564-4482

Email: kevinj@uppersiouxcommunity-nsn.gov

Karen James

Phone: (651) 690-1197

Upper Sioux Community: Water System Improvement

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend funds in the bonding bill for this request.

Upper Sioux Community: Water System Improvement

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of the total costs are to be provided federal funds, and an | |
| | additional 25% of the total costs are to be provided from tribal funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | Maintaining or improving infrastructure related to water quality is an | |
| | important state mission. This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes. The Board of Trustees of the Upper Sioux Community, a | |
| | federally-recognized tribe, adopted a resolution of support on June 22, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, | |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |

Vernon Center: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,400,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Vernon Center)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Vernon Center, in Blue Earth County

Project At A Glance

The city of Vernon Center requests \$700,000 to assist in funding a city-wide Sanitary Sewer I&I Abatement Program.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$700,000 in state funding to provide the small town of Vernon Center (pop. 330) with gap financing to supplement local financing to correct our on-going sanitary sewer inflow and infiltration, (I&I) problem. The state funding will allow us to initiate a project to replace and repair the aged clay sanitary sewer system.

A raw sewage overflow has occurred as a result of excessive clear water entering the sanitary sewer collection system during large rain events. Clear water is leaking into the city's sanitary sewer system though cracks, poor service connections, and joints in the clay sewer mains and services. The city is also actively televising individual sewer services to discover and require removal of direct plumbing connections to the system.

Despite the city's efforts, to-date, wet weather flows still have not decreased significantly. Raw sewage overflows continue to be a risk as wet weather flow rates continue to threaten the system's capacity.

A majority of the city's sanitary sewer system was constructed in the late 1940's and most of the system is clay tile. The city's current proposal is to replace or rehabilitate, (through lining) most all of the sewer mains, as well as most sewer services.

Property owners will be assessed for improvements based on the city's assessment policy. The city will provide additional financing with the issuance of revenue and general obligation bonds.

The Blue Earth River is tributary to the Minnesota River just upstream of Mankato. The Blue Earth River is listed as impaired waters on the 2006 Final List of Impaired Waters. This project, as proposed, will assist state goals to improve water quality in the Blue Earth and Minnesota rivers by eliminating the threat of raw sewage overflows and improving sewage effluent from the city's wastewater treatment facility.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this project is \$1.4 million. The city will provide 50 percent of the project's costs through \$700,000 to be provided by the city of Vernon Center. Locally financed through special assessment, water and sewer user rates fund and local city tax levy.

Other Considerations

City of Vernon Center owns and operates the sanitary sewer facilities.

Project Contact Person

Christopher M. Cavett, P.E. Consulting City Engineer 310 Main Avenue West PO Box 776 Gaylord, Minnesota 55334-0776

Phone: (507) 237-2924 Fax: (507) 237-5516 Email: ccavett@sehinc.com

Governor's Recommendations

Vernon Center: Sanitary Sewer I & I Abatement

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the Vernon Center City Council adopted a resolution of support | |
| | on June 18, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, | |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| | | |

Virginia: Mining Haul Road Economic Development

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,825,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of Virginia)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Virginia, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The city of Virginia requests state funding assistance of \$1.825 million for the Mining Haul Road Economic Development Project

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$1,825,532 in state funding to provide public infrastructure and site improvements to the Mining Haul Economic Development Project. Two tenants have been tentatively identified that would result in the retention of approximately 130 jobs and the creation of a minimum of 16 jobs and a significant increase in tax base.

Local Significance:

The project will result in approximately 146 good paying jobs and will increase the tax base of Virginia. Recently, the Iron Range has lost a significant number of jobs in the mining, logging, and paper industries. Creation and retention of jobs is critical to the local economies of Iron Range communities.

Regional Significance:

The Iron Range has experienced continued loss of jobs and tax base at the regional level. The creation and retention of jobs at the Mining Haul Road Economic Development Project will help stabilize the net loss of jobs in the mining, logging, and paper industries.

State significance:

Creation and retention of jobs, and increases in tax base is the goal of the state of Minnesota in providing economic development assistance to promote growth and the overall wellbeing of Minnesota's economy.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of this project is \$3.65 million. The city of Virginia will pay half of the project cost through tax abatement.

Previous Appropriations for this Project

An earlier first phase of this project received a Minnesota Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant of \$300,000 and an Iron Range Resources (IRR) Public Works Grants of \$300,000.

Other Considerations

The city of Virginia will own the public infrastructure that is being extended to the site. Private businesses will own the buildings. No bonding bill funding will be used to assist private development.

Project Contact Person

John Tourville, City Operations Officer City of Virginia 327 First Street South Virginia, Minnesota 55792 Phone: (218) 749-3562

Email: tourvillej@virginiamn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Virginia: Mining Haul Road Economic Development

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <u> </u> | Evaluation of Local Projects |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | Economic development is an important state mission. The state has |
| | existing programs to provide financial assistance in this area. This |
| | project should be considered alongside other similar requests. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will likely be forthcoming from local units of government if |
| | the state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Yes; the Virginia City Council adopted a resolution of support on |
| | June 26, 2007. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | Yes. |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) |
| | been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. |
| | 1 |

Wabasha County: Lake Zumbro Restoration

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$350,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Wabasha county)

PROJECT LOCATION: Wabasha & Olmsted counties

Project At A Glance

Wabasha County is requesting \$350,000 in state funding to design and engineer the dredging and restoration of Lake Zumbro.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Wabasha County is requesting \$350,000 in state funding to design and engineer the dredging and restoration of Lake Zumbro which lies in Wabasha and Olmsted Counties. Lake Zumbro is a very popular recreation lake in southeastern Minnesota with summer use that often exceeds 1,600 people per day. The lake was formed in 1919 when the Rochester Public Utilities installed a hydropower dam. The hydropower facility provides approximately three megawatts of renewable energy. A bathymetric study completed in 2005 found that the Lake has lost approximately half of its volume to sedimentation since 1919. Most of the sedimentation had occurred prior to 1957 when the first lake depth map was completed by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Mapping done in 1978 showed that sedimentation rates had decreased substantially and a detailed map completed in 2005 found that current sedimentation rates are now only ten percent of the pre-1957 rates. Zumbro Watershed Partnership is working to further reduce sedimentation rates in the watershed by 30 percent.

The Lake Zumbro Improvement Association has provided \$60,000 of in-kind contributions to complete the 2005 lake mapping and bathymetric study. Lake Zumbro Forever, Inc. a non-profit organization has contributed \$15,000 in cash to complete an assessment of lake sediments. That funding was

matched by the Rochester Public Utilities. Lab analysis of the core samples found that all of the lake sediment has either a Tier I or a Tier II rating suitable for land disposal. The requested funding will be used to complete the predesign work.

Because of its central location in the region, Lake Zumbro is a major recreational water body for residents of Wabasha, Olmsted, Dodge, and Goodhue Counties. The lake has the highest population relative to lake area in all of greater Minnesota. Communities within 15 miles of the Lake Zumbro that rely on it for recreation include Oronoco, Pine Island, Byron, Rochester, Mantorville, Kasson, Plainview, Hammond, Mazeppa, Zumbro Falls, Goodhue, and Zumbrota.

Minnesota DNR and Olmsted County both maintain boat launches on the Lake. Other public facilities on the Lake include two campgrounds, three restaurants, a marina, and a handicapped accessible public fishing access. Lake Zumbro is a popular fishing lake for bass, crappies, sunfish, northern pike, and muskellunge.

Other Considerations

Lake Zumbro is public waters of the state and will remain in state ownership after its restoration.

Project Contact Person

Bill Angerman, PE 56730 404th Avenue Mazeppa, Minnesota 55956 Phone: (507) 288-3923

Home: (507) 843-4641

Governor's Recommendations

Wabasha County: Lake Zumbro Restoration

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? No non-state funds are identified for this stage of the project in the community's project request. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Providing recreational opportunities and restoring water quality are important state missions. However, the degree to which these types of projects should be funded by the state is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Wabasha County Board adopted a resolution of support on June 19, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |

Wadena: Wadena Regional Wellness Center

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$7,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Wadena)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Wadena, in Wadena County

Project At A Glance

The city of Wadena requests \$7.5 million to construct the Wadena Regional Wellness Center.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$7.5 million in state funding to acquire land, predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip the Wadena Regional Wellness Center for the purpose of providing health, wellness, cultural and educational opportunities to the citizens of Wadena, Todd and Ottertail counties and their respective extended region. The Wadena Regional Wellness Center will be located in Wadena, Minnesota. In addition to the health and wellness benefits of the Wadena Regional Wellness Center, it would provide economic development. Wadena and Todd counties are in the bottom 10 percent of per capita income in the state of Minnesota. Wadena is the county seat of Wadena County and the predominant business center in the Wadena, Todd, Ottertail county area.

The overall emphasis of the Wadena Regional Wellness Center is a multipurpose family orientated center that stresses a wide range of community participation. The Wadena Regional Wellness Center will work with and compliment other community facilities and programs. This will be accomplished through extensive programming opportunities that will be available through area business and government collaborations. Tri- County Hospital Therapeutic program incorporates and cooperates with area hospitals to provide regional rehabilitation and wellness services. Wadena Deer-Creek (WDC) School and its respective athletic programs are collaborative in nature with students participating in extra-curricular activities in and from surrounding communities. Minnesota State Community and Technical College curriculum and programs offer educational, wellness and economic development criteria for students to achieve their potential to develop into pro-active, conscientious citizens of Minnesota and the city of Wadena which continues to respond to the need for growth and economic development of the area by providing city infrastructure, business incentive and amenities to improve the quality of life for citizens who live in and visit the area.

The Wadena Regional Wellness Center committee sought to develop expansion plans that were based on the input from the community reflecting the needs of the communities. Meetings and surveys were conducted with numerous user groups including: The city of Wadena employees, Tri-County Hospital employees, WDC employees and students, Local Townships, County commissioners, Home Crest Industries, Senior Citizens groups, Minnesota Technical and Community College and area citizens. From these meetings and capitalizing on infra-structure already in place, the existing Wadena Community Center Building and the city of Wadena lift station, it was determined that the Regional Wellness Center would have a positive impact on the economic, physical, social and psychological health of the Tri-County area by improving the overall lifestyles for area residents through proactive health facilities, employee opportunities, business health care plans and professional services.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$15,444,914. The city will contribute \$75,000 to the project; \$5.035 million will come from a USDA loan; \$150,000 will come from the Tri County Hospital; \$40,000 will be contributed by the Deer Creek School; and \$3 million is expected to be raised in local pledges.

Other Considerations

The city of Wadena will own the facility. The Wadena Regional Wellness Center, a nonprofit corporation, will be organized to operate the facility. Construction is planned to begin April 2009 and be finished by June 2009.

Wadena: Wadena Regional Wellness Center

Project Contact Person

John Paulson, David Paulson Agency P.O. Box 586 Wadena, Minnesota 56482 Phone: (218) 631-3690

Email: john@paulsonagency.com

Governor's Recommendations

Wadena: Wadena Regional Wellness Center

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 51% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funding sources. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? Not significantly. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? This request is for an uncommon type of project; it does not compare to most other submitted local capital funding requests. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Wadena submitted letters of support from the Wadena campus of Minnesota State Community and Technical College, from Wadena - Deer Creek Public Schools, from the governing board of the Tri- County Hospital, and from the mayor of Wadena. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Not yet submitted. |

Washington County: I-94 Corridor Transitway predesign

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Washington County)

PROJECT LOCATION: I-94 Corridor from St Paul to the St Croix River

Project At A Glance

Washington County, for the I-94 Coalition, is requesting \$1 million for predesign, preliminary engineering, and matching federal funds for transit improvements in the I-94 corridor from the St. Paul Union Depot to the St. Croix River.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

\$1 million is requested in state funds for predesign, preliminary engineering, and to match federal funds for transit improvements in the I-94 Corridor from the St. Paul Union Depot to the St. Croix River.

The I-94 Corridor is part of the Interstate Highway System and is locally and regionally significant. It is this main east/west connection between the eastern metropolitan area and downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis. It also is the interstate connection between the Twin Cities, Madison, Milwaukee, and Chicago. Additionally, the Union Pacific Railway mainline parallels the corridor and connects the Twin Cities and Minnesota to Chicago and the West Coast.

The I-94 Corridor is well positioned to provide convenient access from the suburbs to/from the central cities. It will utilize the St. Paul Union Depot Multimodal hub as its downtown St. Paul station where it will connect to the Central Corridor Light Rail, and the Red Rock and Rush Line Corridors. Utilizing these corridor connections, I-94 riders will be able to access downtown Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota, and the Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport.

Total Project Cost: The identified cost for predesign and design is \$1 million.

Other Considerations

There are currently no non-state funds available for this project. However, the I-94 Coalition will be requesting federal funds in Federal FY 2009.

This request will not cover construction costs for this project. The cost for construction will be determined in predesign/design and will be included in a future bonding request. The total construction costs for the I-94 corridor project is unknown.

The I-94 corridor transit project will be owned and maintained by the state. New state operating dollars will be needed to provide transit service in the corridor. Type and amount of service will be determined as part of Predesign/Design of the Corridor and through consultation with the Metropolitan Council and Metro Transit. A funding request will be developed once the operating costs are determined.

Project Contact Person

Mike Rogers Associate Transportation Planner **Washington County** 11660 Myeron Road North Stillwater, Minnesota 55082 Phone: (651) 430-4338

Email Michael.rogers@co.washington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

Washington County: I-94 Corridor Transitway predesign

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? No non-state funds for this predesign are identified in the project request information. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Transportation is an important state mission. In the metropolitan area the Metropolitan Council and Mn/DOT are responsible for transportation planning and programming and prioritizing state funding for transportation projects. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? State funding could be requested, depending on the improvements made. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Washington County Board adopted a resolution of support on July 10, 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? Not required for this type of project. | |

Western Mesabi Mine Planning Bd: Canisteo Outflow

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,260,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Western Mesabi Mine Planning

Board)

PROJECT LOCATION: Itasca County

Project At A Glance

The Western Mesabi Mine Planning Board requests \$3,259,682 in state funding for the Canisteo outflow project.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3,259,682 in state funding to construct the Canisteo outflow project; this would include acquiring easements, permitting, construction, administration/construction management, and related costs through the start-up period through acceptance of the project following acceptable demonstration of completion and operability of the facilities. The project comprises a water control and conveyance system to safely and effectively move water from the Canisteo pit (in which the state has a major interest and where rising water levels are creating significant public safety and environmental concerns), through Trout Lake, to the Swan River. The project is important to reduce public safety concerns in and around the cities of Bovey, Coleraine, and Taconite and the townships of Arbo, Iron Range, and Trout Lake in Itasca County.

The water level in the Canisteo area has been continually rising since pumping of water from this inactive group of mines was discontinued in 1986. It is expected that the water level will rise by 2009-2014 to an elevation that will cause water to overflow natural topography in an uncontrolled manner; a breakthrough in the loose soils could occur before the referenced overflow dates. If uncontrolled discharge occurs, there is a possibility of significant

damage to public and private property and perhaps to life and safety in Bovey and Coleraine and to property along the shoreline of Trout Lake and/or Holman Lake. Uncontrolled release of those waters also carries the potential of environmental damage to Trout Lake and/or Holman Lake. In addition, while the water continues to rise, property and economic damage is occurring to an important railroad route that services northeastern Minnesota (railroad service has been halted for more than three years due to the problem) and created a situation where other public infrastructure and private property are endangered. Timely selection and construction of a water level and outflow control system is expected to improve public safety, reduce the threats to public and private property, provide environmental benefits to the water quality of Trout Lake, serve an important role in ameliorating regional economic disruptions, and minimize or eliminate the potential for having to deal with potential emergency conditions.

The physical situation was identified several years ago and the threat has increased as the water level has continued to rise. Programs exist to monitor and report upon water level changes. Data indicate that the water level is continuing to increase. There has been substantial public involvement in and support for the project. Relevant Federal agencies are aware of the situation but have not committed to participate. Two major studies funded by public and private sources were completed that serve as the basis for the project. Western Mesabi Mine Planning Board (WMMPB) identified and selected the preferred alternative and recently completed detailed engineering design and wetland mitigation work. Pre-permitting has begun and the project is substantially ready for construction to begin upon confirmation of state funds availability.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$3,259,682. No non-state funds will be contributed to this project.

Other Considerations

The WMMPB will be the initial owner and operator of the project. It is likely that project ownership and operation will ultimately transfer to one or more other responsible government units.

Western Mesabi Mine Planning Bd: Canisteo Outflow

Project Contact Person

R.D. Learmont, Coordinator Western Mesabi Mine Planning Board PO Box 166 Bovey, Minnesota 55709 Email: dlearmon@2z.net

Governor's Recommendations

Western Mesabi Mine Planning Bd: Canisteo Outflow

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|---|--|
| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| No non-state funds are identified in the project request information. | |
| Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| Floodwater control is an important state mission. The state has an | |
| existing grant program to provide financial assistance in this area. | |
| This project should be considered alongside other similar requests. | |
| Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| Potentially, although no request has been or is being made for | |
| operating subsidies at this time. | |
| Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| See #2 above. | |
| Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| projects. | |
| Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| No. | |
| Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| Yes, the joint powers board adopted a resolution of support on June | |
| 14, 2007. | |
| Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| requesting? | |
| N/A | |
| Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| been submitted? | |
| A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, | |
| floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer | |
| separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| | |

Wheelers Pt Sewer District: Collection & Treatment

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$3,500,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Wheelers Point Sanitary Sewer District)

PROJECT LOCATION: Wheeler Township, in Lake of the Woods County

Project At A Glance

Wheelers Point Sanitary Sewer District requests \$3.5 million for a sanitary sewer collection and treatment system.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

This request is for \$3.5 million as a state grant to help pay for land acquisition, engineering, and construction costs related to a sanitary sewer collection and treatment system to serve the Wheelers Point Sewer District in Lake of the Woods County.

The existing sewage treatment systems for residences and businesses within the district were designed for limited use and subsequent low wastewater flows. Over time the increase in tourism and the conversion from seasonal to year-round residences, have resulted in the overloading of these systems. System failures are becoming more and more frequent. The existing high density development combined with the smaller lot sizes does not conveniently, or may not; allow for a replacement ISTS system because of the space constraints, soil suitability, mandated set-back guidelines and other state and local septic code requirements. These are problems that both residential property owners and commercial business owners are currently faced with.

In order to preserve a healthy public and natural environment, which are vital to maintaining the strong economic tourism foundation of the area; it is

essential that the wastewater generated within the area be properly treated. Many of the areas businesses are continually spending money on temporary fixes to their failing septic systems. The Wheeler's Point Community would benefit, and is in need of an alternative method of wastewater treatment. Lower costs for businesses translate into greater opportunities to reinvest in new jobs, training, advertising etc. The wastewater needs continue to grow within the area and it is vital that the proper steps are taken now to ensure the long-term continued prosperity and well being of the area.

A recent needs and feasibility study looked at many factors which included existing development densities, parcel size, existing wastewater flows, available space, soils and hydrologic conditions. The study identified the Wheeler's Point community to be and area in most urgent need of a sanitary sewer collection and treatment system.

Since completion of the study, the following has been completed:

- Wheeler's Point sanitary district has been formed
- ♦ Facilities Plan submitted to Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Project has been placed on the MPCA's Project Priority List (PPL)
- Ranked at #41 out of 259 total projects with a total of 61 points

In 2006 the project fell within the fundable range for Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund. However, money is now needed to help offset the projected project costs. The projected cost listed on MPCA's PPL for the systems design, land acquisition and construction is projected to be approximately \$7 million. The intent of the district is to seek the procurement of grants and other moneys to offset the projected costs.

This project has local, regional, and statewide significance in that it will:

- Accommodate expansion of existing businesses
- Promote the development of new businesses
- ♦ Spur increased private real-estate investments
- Help retain local tourism related jobs which pay more than \$33 million annually
- Ensure the continued growth and maintenance of the local tourism driven economy which brings in more than \$21.6 million annually

Wheelers Pt Sewer District: Collection & Treatment

Addressing the wastewater needs of the Wheeler's Point Community is also a common goal which is currently identified as a priority in several local plans which include: Rainy River Basin Plan, Lake of the Woods County Comprehensive Local Water Management Plan, and Lake of the Woods County Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$7 million. Local government funds will provide \$1.5 million of the total cost. An EDA grant of \$2 million will also be applied for to help pay for the project.

Other Considerations

Construction will begin in August 2008 and end in September 2009.

Project Contact Person

Nathan Kestner (Project Consultant) Freeberg & Grund, Inc. 208 Fourth Street NW Bemidji, Minnesota 56601

Governor's Recommendations

Wheelers Pt Sewer District: Collection & Treatment

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | 21% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial | |
| | assistance in this area. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes; the planning board adopted a resolution of support on June 14, | |
| | 2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A ~ | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, | |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer | |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. | |
| L | coparation projecte, or material matternation racinities. | |

White, Town of: Road and Recreation Trail

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$450,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (White, Town of)

PROJECT LOCATION: Town of White, in St Louis County

Project At A Glance

The town of White requests \$450,000 for a new road and recreation trail.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The town of White is requesting \$450,000 in state funding in 2008, to complete the construction of a new bituminous surfaced roadway between State Highway 135 and St. Louis County Highway 138.

The entire project consists of three components; roadway, bicycle/walking trail, and snowmobile trail. The roadway component will provide access between the city of Aurora and the Giants Ridge recreational facilities and provide a safer access to Voyageur's Retreat, a new 246 single family residential development on the east side of Wynne and Sabin Lakes. Although the housing development is located in the city of Biwabik, the only access into the Voyageur's Retreat development is located in the town of White.

On 1-6-05 the Biwabik Planning Commission approved the preliminary plat, submitted by Naterra Land, for the 1st phase of the housing development consisting of 36 lake lots and 24 back lots. The city of Biwabik approved these plans without addressing issues relating to access into to development area.

Due to this new residential development, use of the current access has created several safety concerns. Increased traffic, poor visibility and location

of the existing trails in and along the roadway is a major safety concern. The gravel road that is currently being used as an entrance road to the development was originally an old mining road and was not established, constructed, or designed for a public roadway. It is suitable only for occasional or intermittent traffic. As the township is the designated road authority with jurisdiction over the road, increased traffic could unnecessarily expose the town to liability.

The town of White acquired the road from the boat landing to Co. Hwy. 138 as part of its road system pursuant to M.S.160.05. Under the provisions of the statute, the town acquired an interest in the road only to the width of actual use and maintenance, and not to the full 66 foot default width. In order to make the necessary improvements to the roadway, the township needed to obtain additional right-of-way. The town of White has been working with the East Range Joint Powers Board and S.E.H. Engineering for the past three years on establishing the best location for the snowmobile trail, walking/biking trail connection to the Mesabi Trail, roadway design, and in obtaining the necessary easements for the project.

The new roadway will greatly enhance public safety as it will decrease emergency response time for firefighters, first responders and arrival time to the White Community Hospital. In addition, it will provide direct access to the Giants Ridge Recreation facilities and the town of White's Lake Mine Boat Landing.

The recreational trail component of the project will link the existing dead-end portion of the Mesabi Trail system to the city of Aurora trail system. This trail is planned to be a 10-foot wide bituminous paved trail with gravel shoulders that match the features of the existing Mesabi Trail.

The existing snowmobile route will be rerouted to run parallel to the new roadway.

Since the LTV shutdown, the East Range Communities have planned for economic recovery and diversification by establishing designated areas for business development and providing the necessary infrastructure and programs to encourage business to locate in the East Range Area. In addition, we have identified tracts of land most suitable for higher density residential development that will promote efficient land use patterns, support

White, Town of: Road and Recreation Trail

growth and utilize the infrastructure investment made by the town of White, East Range Communities, state of Minnesota, and private investors.

Planning new residential development areas offers the chance to define a larger vision for the growth of the area that will enhance the character of the community, improve connections between neighborhoods, public amenities and include a mix of housing types that will address the full range of local housing needs. The proximity of the project area to the site of the Mesabi Nugget Project will greatly encourage development as it would also reduce the distance which workers must travel to reach employment. These plans will ensure the town of White and east range area is well prepared to meet the housing needs of all residents by encouraging private sector development of a variety of housing types, styles that meet affordability and the life-cycle housing needs of a growing community.

As economic recovery and diversification through business development expand, the need for recreation opportunities grows and expands as well. The town of White Road/Recreation Trail Project clearly provides an overall new travel opportunity for vehicles and all forms of recreational trail usage to the entire East Range Area.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$911,916. The town of White will contribute \$386,916 to the project and \$75,000 will come from mine land reclamation funds.

Other Considerations

The town of White will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Curt Anttila Economic Development Coordinator PO Box 127 Aurora, Minnesota 55705

Phone: (218) 229-3671 Fax: (218) 229-2081

Email: erjpb@cpinternet.com

Governor's Recommendations

White, Town of: Road and Recreation Trail

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? 51% of project costs are to be provided from non-state funding sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? Transportation and recreation are important state missions. However, the extent to which local transportation corridors and recreational trails are a state versus local funding responsibility is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? See #2 above. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? Yes; the Town of White Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution of support on June 2, 2005. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is requesting? N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of roads, bridges trails or pathways. | |
| | bridges, trails or pathways. | |

Williams: Wastewater Treatment Plant Repair

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$150,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Williams)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Williams, in Lake of the Woods County

Project At A Glance

The city of Williams requests \$150,000 to repair its wastewater treatment plant.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

These monies are to be used to stop current pitting and corroding that is occurring in our Wastewater Treatment Plant aeration and clarifying tanks before it eats all the way through the aluminum and starts leaking. The city of Williams can't afford to carry this debt all on its own due to the \$21,000 in loan payments that we make to the USDA Rural Development annually on this six year old system. It's not self supporting as it is and this will literally shut the city down if we don't get any state funding to help with this. The state and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) mandated that the city of Williams put this new facility in six years ago and the city ended up barrowing \$282,000 over and above the grant monies that were received in order to complete the project. Now, six years later we have a problem that is going to possible cost the city another \$150,000 in order to fix and needs to be addressed as soon as possible before we have to shut down our Wastewater Treatment Plant completely and leave 204 residents without any sewer at all.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$150,000; no non-state funds will be contributed.

Other Considerations

The city of Williams will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Randie Johnson City of Williams P.O. Box 98 Williams, Minnesota 56686 Phone: (218) 783-4418

Fax: (218) 783-4418 Fax: (218) 783-3272

Email: cityofwilliams@wiktel.com

Governor's Recommendations

Williams: Wastewater Treatment Plant Repair

| Evaluation of Local Projects | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? |
| | The city is requesting 100% state funding. |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? |
| | The state has an existing grant program to provide financial |
| | assistance in this area. |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? |
| | No. |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? |
| | No. |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the |
| | state provides funding for this project. |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? |
| | No. |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? |
| | Not yet provided. |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is |
| | requesting? |
| | N/A |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? |
| | A project predesign is not required for projects consisting of dams, |
| | floodwater retention systems, water access sites, harbors, sewer |
| | separation projects, or water and wastewater facilities. |

Windom: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,075,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (City of Windom)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Windom, in Cottonwood County

Project At A Glance

The city of Windom requests state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$775,000 to renovate and expand the city's fire hall
- ♦ \$300,000 to renovate the Des Moines River Dam

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Fire Hall Addition and Renovation

The city of Windom is requesting state funding of \$775,000 to construct, furnish and equip the renovation and expansion of the existing fire hall. The city of Windom is located in Cottonwood County, on U.S. Highway 71 and Minnesota Highway 60, approximately 125 miles southwest of the Twin Cities. The city's fire department is comprised of 29 volunteer firefighters and operates 14 pieces of equipment that need to be stored in a central location to facilitate optimum response times. The existing fire hall is over 40 years old, contains six bays and support areas covering approximately 4,100 square feet. The existing fire hall space also supports ambulance services and houses two ambulance units.

The city of Windom is planning to construct a fire station located adjacent to the existing Fire Hall at 444 9th Street. The addition to the existing fire hall is estimated by the architect to be approximately 8,850 square feet. The new addition would feature double-deep bays for equipment storage with approximately 2,350 square feet of support space. This option would also

include design of approximately 20 off-site parking spaces and 18,000 square feet of on-site parking.

The fire department and city council have identified the need to replace or modify the fire hall that was originally built in 1964. When the fire hall was built, equipment size and needs were much different than they are today. As equipment evolves, the original design of the fire hall is becoming increasingly inadequate to serve the needs of the department.

The fire hall no longer accommodates the quantity or size of equipment required by today's average fire department. The fire department is currently storing fire fighting and rescue equipment in several locations throughout the city. Due to the storage inadequacies, when emergency calls are received, equipment is not always readily accessible by the department. The fire hall's shortcomings include its inability to adequately accommodate the department's equipment; its inability to provide sufficient space for rapid, unhindered movement of firefighters within the facility; and its inability to provide sufficient space to prevent accidental interaction between firefighters and equipment, thereby creating serious safety issues. Because of the size of the confined space and the close proximity of firefighters and equipment, there are also air quality issues.

The Windom Volunteer Fire Department provides fire services to the city of Wilder, city of Bingham Lake and nine townships located in Cottonwood and Jackson Counties. The city of Windom contributes 67 percent of the department's annual operations budget. The cities of Bingham Lake and Wilder and the nine townships, through flat rate long-term contracts, provide 33 percent of the budget. In an average year, 52 percent of all fire calls come from areas outside the city limits. However, in recent years, the fire calls from the service area outside the city limits have been well above the average with the highest year at 74 percent of all calls. Because over 50 percent of the calls are from outside the city limits, a request has been made to the contracted cities and townships to assist with funds needed to renovate the existing and build a new fire hall addition.

Due to the rural nature of the area, declining population and low household median incomes, these cities and townships do not have the resources needed to contribute additional funds for the annual operations budget. Currently these entities are only funding 33 percent of the operations budget

Windom: Two Projects

and they are hesitant with funding commitments needed to assist with the fire hall renovation or construction. Recently one township terminated fire service agreements for several sections partially due to the impending cost associated with the fire hall project.

Priority 1 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$1.55 million. The city of Windom will contribute \$520,000 to the project cost and \$280,000 will come from a fire contract contribution.

Priority 2: Des Moines River Dam Renovation/Removal

The city of Windom is requesting state funding of \$300,000 for engineering and design work on the dam project (including civil engineering, hydrology studies, design\engineering work for stream restoration and trails) and construction\removal\renovation of the dam. The city of Windom is located in Cottonwood County, on U.S. Highway 71 and Minnesota Highway 60, approximately 125 miles southwest of the Twin Cities.

In Spring 2007 the Des Moines River worked its way around the dam structure and is eroding the river bank in Island Park. The city of Windom has met set up a committee consisting of the Mayor, a city council member, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) representative and two city staff members to discuss this matter and consider options.

Due to the existing condition of the Windom Dam the DNR has moved up this project to number four on their priority list. The current situation poses a safety hazard to the public. Attached as Exhibit 1 are photographs of the dam's condition. The DNR has worked with a number of Minnesota communities on dam safety and removal options. This focus by the DNR presents the city of Windom with an opportunity to fully discuss the status of the dam and possible options with the community. On 07-17-2007 a DNR expert on dams will be making a presentation to the Windom city council.

The dam was originally constructed in 1878 for the Windom Flour Mill. That dam was washed out in 1885 and reconstructed. In 1923 the mill was destroyed by fire and in 1926 the city purchased approximately 50 acres along the Des Moines River which included the old Mill site and area around the dam. After the floods of 1962, which had carried away much of the wooden parts of the dam, the city undertook a major renovation project in the

winter of 1962-63 where the dam was repaired and reinforced. In the 1980s dam was again repaired.

The city of Windom has a heavy debt load due to numerous projects (Fiber to the Home Telecom system, Community Center and Public Works projects) and a limited tax base. As such, state funding is critical to the Windom Dam Project. Windom's tax capacity has grown only slightly and current tax levies are high. In addition to city taxes the local school district is considering an operating levy that will go to voters in Fall 2007. With limited taxing and debt capacities the city has had to prioritize present and future public projects. In 2008-09 the city is anticipating the construction of an addition and renovation to the fire hall thus leaving only very limited funding available to address the Windom dam.

Priority 2 Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$700,000. The city of Windom will contribute \$50,000 to the project; \$350,000 in funding is expected from the DNR.

Other Considerations

The city of Windom will own and operate the facilities.

Project Contact Person

Steven Nasby, City Administrator City of Windom 444 9th Street P.O. Box 38 Windom, Minnesota 56101

Phone: (507) 831-6129 Fax: (507) 831-6127

Email: snasby@windom-mn.com Web: www.windom-mn.com

Governor's Recommendations

Windom: Two Projects

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | For Priority #1, 50% local funds will mathc 50% in state G.O. bond | |
| | funding. | |
| | For Priority #2, 7% of project costs are to be provided from local | |
| | government funds, and 50% of project costs are anticipated to be | |
| | funded through non-G.O. bond state sources. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | For Priority #1, the state role in funding general municipal buildings is | |
| | unclear. | |
| | For Priority #2, floodwater control is an important state mission. The | |
| | state has an existing grant program to provide financial assistance in | |
| | this area. This project should be considered alongside other flood | |
| 3. | control requests. Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| ٥. | These projects are primarily of local significance. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| ٦. | No. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If these two projects are funded, other local jurisdictions could seek | |
| | state funding for similar projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | No. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | Yes, the Windom City Council adopted a resolution of support on | |
| | June 19,2007. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| 40 | Yes. | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? | |
| | A predesign is not required for the fire hall project, because its | |
| | construction costs are less than \$1.5 million. A predesign is not | |
| | required for a flood control project. | |
| | required for a mood control project. | |

Worthington: Fire Hall Construction

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,565,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Worthington)

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Worthington, in Nobles County

Project At A Glance

The city of Worthington requests \$1.565 million for the construction of a new fire hall.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The city of Worthington is requesting a capital appropriation of \$1.565 million to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new fire hall in Nobles County in the city of Worthington to provide firefighting services in Worthington and the surrounding area, provide a regional decontamination response, provide statewide and regional training opportunities and provide a community meeting room.

The current fire hall was built in 1966 and no longer meets the service standard necessary for firefighting in a diverse regional center. Since 1966 Worthington has grown in population, diversity, and commercialization, cementing its place as a regional hub. Forty-one years ago high-rise buildings weren't anticipated, nor was one of the nation's largest hog processing plants; these changes and the size of the current fire hall and the size of apparatuses needed to fight fires at high-rise buildings and large commercial operations make it necessary for construction of a new fire hall.

The current fire hall is in a residential district which makes it difficult for safe entry and exit during emergencies. The current building has limited storage space for apparatuses currently needed to combat fires and other emergency calls for service in the surrounding area. The limited storage area also affects

the ability to store the decontamination trailer that the state of Minnesota granted us; the trailer, which serves a regional purpose and is valued at \$80,000 should be stored indoors so that it will be operational in the time of need.

The current fire hall has limited training space, not enough to train the entire department simultaneously. A training room that could support 50 people would serve several purposes: it could be used for regional emergency management, police and fire training as well as a community meeting room, it could serve as a secondary emergency operations center (EOC) and it could be used for local training and meeting purposes.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$3.130 million. The city of Worthington will contribute \$1.565 million to the total project cost.

Other Considerations

The city of Worthington will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Rick Von Holdt, Fire Chief 303 9th Street PO Box 279 Worthington, Minnesota 56187

Phone: (507) 360-7240 Fax: (507) 372-5977

Email: rickgtw@frontiernet.net

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Worthington: Fire Hall Construction

| | Evaluation of Legal Projects | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| | Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | | |
| | 50% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | | |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. | | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | | |
| | No. | | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | | |
| | No. | | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | | |
| | The number of this type of local request suggests that additional | | |
| | requests will be forthcoming from local units of government if the | | |
| | state provides funding for this project. | | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | | |
| | Not significantly. | | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | | |
| | Yes; the Worthington City Council adopted a resolution of support on | | |
| | June 18, 2007. | | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | | |
| | requesting? | | |
| | N/A | | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | | |
| | been submitted? | | |
| | A predesign has not yet been submitted to the Department of | | |
| | Administration. | | |
| | | | |

Wright County: Regional Park Land Acquisition

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$8,000,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Wright County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Wright County

Project At A Glance

Wright County requests \$8 million to acquire land for a regional park.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Wright County and the city of Monticello are submitting a request for \$8 million that will enable us to acquire 1,200 acres, including undeveloped lakes, in Wright County (Monticello Township/city), currently owned by the YMCA of Minneapolis, which will be used for the preservation of open space and natural resources for future public and current enjoyment and recreation. We are asking the state to supplement a \$24 million project, with \$8 million to come from each Wright County and Monticello city. Both the county and the city have adopted resolutions indicating their support of this land acquisition.

Wright County is one of the fastest growing counties in Minnesota, and with an increase in population and development comes an increased demand for recreational opportunities. As competition for land heats up between those who wish to develop and those who desire to preserve some of our open spaces, costs begin to rise and open areas begin to disappear. It is our hope that early action and commitment on our part will help us protect recreational and outdoor opportunities for generations to come. In order to do this, we will need more funds than those that are available to us at a local level, and we are asking the state to consider contributing one-third of the projected cost. Even though the property under consideration is located in Wright County, many of our park users are Minnesota citizens from outside our county, and

this acquisition by the county/city will further enhance the quality of outdoor recreation in our state.

User surveys taken by Wright County at two of our regional parks during the past three years indicate that about 40% of all visitors come from neighboring counties, the metro area, and greater Minnesota. In evaluating the regional significance of this proposed Regional Park, it is likely that these numbers will increase due to the proximity to the metro area and transportation corridors.

The Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation (SCORP) identified seven priorities that were adopted by Minnesota Outdoor Recreation Policy Advisors. This project will address all of them.

- ♦ Protect and restore the natural resource base on which outdoor recreation depends—lakes, streams, wetlands, forests, and grasslands.
- Help sustain outdoor recreation facilities for future generations.
- Help reserve prime recreational lands in areas of rapid population growth ahead of development and provide recreational facilities such as trails, water access, shore land, and natural areas.
- Will help respond to demands of Minnesota's changing population by providing diverse form of outdoor recreation to the aging population as well as cultural diversity.
- Will expand nature based outdoor recreation experiences for youth living in urban areas, by providing youth with close-by access to natural areas.
- Improve coordination between governmental agencies by creating a partnership that will work together to plan, maintain, and offer a full range of recreational opportunities.
- Increase the capacity of Minnesota's natural resource to support satisfying outdoor recreational opportunities.

Wright County is located in central Minnesota, and our parks already serve many people from the greater regional area. The beautiful landscape and rural setting in our county both contribute to our high quality of life. Preserving this current YMCA property for recreational and outdoor activities will enable us to share that quality of life with people who are seeking opportunities to enjoy the outdoors in an area close to where they live. Even as open space in the metro area disappears to development, urban residents do not relinquish their desire and need to enjoy an area that is free from the

Wright County: Regional Park Land Acquisition

noise and congestion that go hand in hand with an urban setting. Wright County's population is growing fast, and developers are working hard to meet the demand for housing and business. We must act quickly and soon if we are to have a hand in helping shape the quality of life for current and future citizens.

Total Project Cost

The total cost of the project is \$24 million. Wright County will contribute \$8 million to the total project cost and the city of Monticello will provide \$8 million.

Other Considerations

Wright County and the city of Monticello will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Marc Mattice, Parks Administrator 1901 Highway 25 North Buffalo, Minnesota 55313

Phone: (763) 682-7693 Fax: (763) 682-7313

Email: marc.mattice@co.wright.mn.us

Jeff O'Neill, City Administrator 505 Walnut Street Suite #1 Monticello, Minnesota 55362

Phone: (763) 271-3215 Fax: (763) 295-4404

Email: jeff.oneill@ci.monticello.mn.us

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for this request.

Wright County: Regional Park Land Acquisition

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 4 | Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | | |
| | 66% of project costs are to be provided from local government funds. | | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | | |
| | Providing recreational opportunities is an important state mission. | | |
| | However, the degree to which these types of local projects should be | | |
| | funded by the state is unclear. | | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local or regional benefit. | | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | | |
| | No. | | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | | |
| | See #2 above. | | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | | |
| | projects. | | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | | |
| | Not significantly. | | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | | |
| | Yes; the Wright County Board adopted a resolution of support on | | |
| | June 12, 2007 and the Monticello City Council adopted a resolution | | |
| | of support on June 25, 2007. | | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | | |
| | requesting? | | |
| | N/A | | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | | |
| - | been submitted? | | |
| | Predesign is not required for this type of project. | | |
| | | | |

Yellow Medicine County: Two Projects

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$1,300,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Yellow Medicine County)

PROJECT LOCATION: Yellow Medicine County

Project At A Glance

Yellow Medicine County requests state funding for two projects (listed in priority order):

- ♦ \$200,000 for improvements to Minnesota's Machinery Museum
- ♦ \$1.1 million for a new agricultural education and exhibit center

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

Priority 1: Minnesota's Machinery Museum

This request is for \$200,000 in state funding for use in upgrading the electrical system and air quality for the purpose of accommodating the installation of an elevator to provide handicap accessibility to all three floors of Minnesota's Machinery Museum in Hanley Falls, Minnesota located in Yellow Medicine County.

The cost is derived from the architectural firm of Vetter and Johnson's assessment of an elevator addition and mechanical/electrical improvements to the main building. Upgrading the building's electrical system is essential to the long-term sustainability of the Museum itself. Air quality improvements in a public building and a historical museum are of great concern. Presently the building has very limited heating as noted in the assessment and use of the basement for a research area is not possible until these improvements are made. The elevator installation will, of course, allow access for everyone.

Minnesota's Machinery Museum in Hanley Falls just off state Highway 23, celebrates the state's agricultural heritage. It is an ongoing, established enterprise that enjoys the active support of residents and businesses in the surrounding area with 273 members. In 2006 visitors came from 42 states and six countries. Students from area schools (including the local college), bus tours and other organizations frequently visit the museum for tours and to learn about agriculture, Minnesota style.

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the Minnesota's Machinery Museum project is \$960,000. Yellow Medicine County will contribute \$20,000; \$740,000 is expected from the federal government.

Project Contact Person

Mavis Gustafson, Executive Director PO Box 70

Hanley Falls, Minnesota 56245

Phone: (507) 768-3522 or (507) 768-3580

Fax: (507) 768-3522

Email: agmuseum@frontiernet.net

Other Considerations

Minnesota's Machinery Museum is owned and operated by Yellow Medicine County. It is a non-profit organization.

Priority 2: Southwest Minnesota Prairie Farm Preservation Education and Exhibit Center

This request is for \$1.1 million in state funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new agricultural education and exhibit center for education purposes to be located in Yellow Medicine County, Minnesota. The agricultural education and exhibit center will provide opportunity for state residents and Midwestern travelers to better understand early prairie farm family life and farming practices; the evolution of mechanization of farm equipment; and, the prairie native habitat. This will be accomplished by creating a early prairie farm experience with exhibits, displays of farm machinery, overnight stays at the bunk house, participation in early farming activities and consuming authentic farm meals.

Yellow Medicine County: Two Projects

Total Project Cost: The total cost of the project is \$2.2 million. Of the total, \$1.1 million will come from non-state funds.

Other Considerations

Yellow Medicine County will own and operate the facility.

Project Contact Person

Dick Regnier 2851 200th Avenue Porter, Minnesota 56280 Phone: (507) 224-2243 Fax: (507) 224-2243

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend capital funds for these requests.

Yellow Medicine County: Two Projects

| | Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | | |
| | Priority 1: 20% of project costs are to be provided from local | | |
| | government funds. | | |
| | Priority 2: 50% of project costs are to be provided from non-state | | |
| | funds. | | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? No. | | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | | |
| | These projects are viewed as having a primarily local benefit. | | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? No. | | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | | |
| 0. | No. | | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | | |
| | projects. | | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | | |
| | Not significantly. | | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | | |
| | The Yellow Medicine County Board adopted a resolution of support on June 12, 2007. | | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | | |
| | requesting? | | |
| | Yes. | | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) been submitted? | | |
| | Predesigns are not required for either of these local government | | |
| | projects because the construction costs of each project are less than \$1.5 million. | | |

Minnesota Military Museum

2008 STATE APPROPRIATION REQUEST: \$80,000

AGENCY PROJECT PRIORITY: 1 of 1 (Non-Profit Org: Minn Military

Museum)

PROJECT LOCATION: Camp Ripley, Little Falls (In Morrison County)

Project At A Glance

\$80,000 in state General Fund dollars is requested for a predesign of the long-range space needs and future expansion of the Minnesota Military Museum.

The complete submission from this local government is posted at www.budget.state.mn.us/budget/capital/2008/final/index.shtml

Project Description

The Minnesota Military Museum was established at Camp Ripley in 1976. It is operated in public trust by the Military Historical Society of Minnesota (MHSM), an independent, nonprofit educational corporation organized to interpret and preserve the state's military history. The museum is recognized by the U.S. Army museum system, which enables it to acquire and display historical federal military property. In 2006 the museum had 14,039 visitors, including 72 tour groups. Military personnel account for about 15 percent of visitors; the rest are members of the general public.

In terms of its physical plant, the museum has essentially evolved in piecemeal fashion. In 1986-87 its current building was remodeled and expanded specifically for the purpose of housing a museum. Since then, several adjacent buildings have been added as the need arose and space became available. The additional structures are used for storage and work areas, library, archives and vehicle exhibits. The entire complex now consists of eight buildings (four are unheated), connected by sidewalks and comprising 19,150 square feet. Outdoor exhibit areas cover another 15,500

square feet. In spite of recent improvements and space gains the shortcomings of the museum's physical plant are becoming increasingly problematic.

The Board of Directors of the Minnesota Military Museum now seeks state support of \$80,000 to develop a plan that addresses long-range space needs for the military museum at Camp Ripley. The first phase of this plan, a "Pre-Design Study," would be carried out by an architectural design firm experienced in such work. The firm would be asked to:

- Develop an inventory of existing buildings and building conditions, along with current space utilization in these structures. Gather documentation of site and existing building plans.
- Facilitate the development of a site activities and space needs program that outlines future development and expansion of the museum, including interior and exterior space usage.
- Develop conceptual and schematic design plan alternatives for best use of the existing building and site, along with expansion potential for exhibit preparation and staging, storage space, gathering and presentation areas for the public and for the museum store. Long-range plans will address adjacency relationships and convenient operation of storage, exhibit preparation and expansion of exhibition space. Concepts will include analysis of visitor experience and flow through the museum with recommendations for sound (narration), improved display lighting, signage and graphics. Other aspects of enhancing the visitor experience and historical significance of the exhibits will address the image of the facilities and exhibition areas, while providing for flexibility and ease of rotating and changing exhibits. The visitor experience should begin with an identifiable arrival point.
- Concept plans (to include diagrams and sketches) would be reviewed with Camp Ripley facilities personnel and local code authorities. The master plan would address building codes, handicapped accessibility, life safety, materials, systems and standards. An estimate of probable construction costs for the various phases of expansion and upgrading of the facilities will be included in the study.

Minnesota Military Museum

Total Project Cost

The total project cost of this predesign study phase is \$80,000.

Project Contact Person

David L. Hanson, Executive Director Minnesota Military Museum 15000 Hwy. 115 Camp Ripley Little Falls, Minnesota 56345 Museum phone:(320) 632-7374

Museum fax: (320) 632-7374 Home phone: (320) 632-7374

Museum Email: mnmuseum@brainerd.net

Governor's Recommendations

The governor does not recommend funds in the bonding bill for this request.

Minnesota Military Museum

| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Evaluation of Local Projects | | |
| 1. | To what extent are non-state matching funds contributed? | |
| | All of project costs are being sought from state government funds. | |
| 2. | Does project help fulfill an important state mission? | |
| | The state mission in funding this type of project is unclear. | |
| 3. | Is project of regional or statewide significance? | |
| | This project is viewed as having primarily a local benefit. | |
| 4. | Are new or additional state operating subsidies required? | |
| | If this project is funded, it is expected that there will be a future | |
| | request for construction funding. | |
| 5. | Has a state role been expanded in a new policy area? | |
| | No. | |
| 6. | Are inequities created among local jurisdictions? | |
| | If funded, other local jurisdictions could seek state funding for similar | |
| | projects. | |
| 7. | Does project compete with other facilities? | |
| | Not significantly. | |
| 8. | Has local governing body provided a resolution of support? | |
| | No. | |
| 9. | Has local governing body prioritized among all projects it is | |
| | requesting? | |
| | N/A | |
| 10. | Has a predesign (required if construction cost is over \$1.5 million) | |
| | been submitted? | |
| | No, because the request for state funds is for predesign funding. | |