

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 1 | Albert Lea, City of | Project Summary | | 25,250 | 0 | 0 | 25,250 | 5,250 |
| 2 | | Flood Mitigation for East Main Street - US Trunk Highway 65 | 1 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| 6 | | Blazing Star Trail | 2 | 1,750 | 0 | 0 | 1,750 | 1,750 |
| 10 | | Blazing Star Landing | 3 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 |
| 15 | Alexandria, City of | Project Summary | | 5,600 | 0 | 0 | 5,600 | 5,600 |
| 16 | | Runestone Community Center Expansion | 1 | 5,600 | 0 | 0 | 5,600 | 5,600 |
| 21 | Annandale, City of | Project Summary | | 4,559 | 0 | 0 | 4,559 | 0 |
| 22 | | Trunk Highways 24 and 55 Road and Water Infrastructure Improvements | 1 | 4,559 | 0 | 0 | 4,559 | 0 |
| 27 | Anoka County | Project Summary | | 30,600 | 0 | 0 | 30,600 | 0 |
| 28 | | U.S. Highway 10 - Adding One Lane | 1 | 17,600 | 0 | 0 | 17,600 | 0 |
| 32 | | Trunk Highway 47 Railroad Grade Separation | 2 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 37 | | TH 65 Grade Separation at 109th Avenue | 3 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| 41 | | Trunk Highway 610 Full-Access Interchange at East River Road | 4 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| 45 | Apple Valley, City of | Project Summary | | 2,625 | 0 | 0 | 2,625 | 0 |
| 46 | | Red Line 147th Street Station Skyway Project | 1 | 2,625 | 0 | 0 | 2,625 | 0 |
| 51 | Arrowhead Regional Corrections | Project Summary | | 3,350 | 0 | 0 | 3,350 | 3,350 |
| 52 | | NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements | 1 | 3,350 | 0 | 0 | 3,350 | 3,350 |
| 56 | Association of Metro Municipalities | Project Summary | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 57 | | Inflow - Infiltration Assistance Capital Proposal | 1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 61 | Aurora, City of | Project Summary | | 6,100 | 0 | 0 | 6,100 | 0 |
| 62 | | East Mesabi Joint Water System | 1 | 6,100 | 0 | 0 | 6,100 | 0 |
| 67 | Austin, City of | Project Summary | | 12,560 | 7,500 | 0 | 20,060 | 0 |
| 68 | | Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 0 | 15,000 | 0 |
| 75 | | 4th Avenue Riverview State Water Trail Enhancement | 2 | 660 | 0 | 0 | 660 | 0 |
| 79 | | Ramsey Scientific and Natural Area Site Improvements | 3 | 4,400 | 0 | 0 | 4,400 | 0 |
| 84 | Avon, City of | Project Summary | | 1,890 | 0 | 0 | 1,890 | 0 |
| 85 | | Transportation Improvements | 1 | 1,890 | 0 | 0 | 1,890 | 0 |
| 90 | Babbitt, City of | Project Summary | | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 5,500 | 0 |
| 91 | | Wastewater Treatment Facility | 1 | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 5,500 | 0 |
| 95 | Becker County | Project Summary | | 3,250 | 0 | 0 | 3,250 | 0 |
| 96 | | Museum Becker County | 1 | 3,250 | 0 | 0 | 3,250 | 0 |
| 101 | Becker, City of | Project Summary | | 24,760 | 0 | 0 | 24,760 | 0 |
| 102 | | Becker Business Park Expansion | 1 | 24,760 | 0 | 0 | 24,760 | 0 |
| 107 | Bemidji, City of | Project Summary | | 8,188 | 0 | 0 | 8,188 | 0 |
| 108 | | Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Water Treatment Plant | 1 | 8,188 | 0 | 0 | 8,188 | 0 |
| 112 | Birchwood Village, City of | Project Summary | | 421 | 0 | 0 | 421 | 0 |
| 113 | | Lift Station Bypass | 1 | 421 | 0 | 0 | 421 | 0 |
| 117 | Blaine, City of | Project Summary | | 950 | 0 | 0 | 950 | 0 |
| 118 | | Greater Twin Cities Public Safety Training Area | 1 | 950 | 0 | 0 | 950 | 0 |
| 122 | Bloomington, City of | Project Summary | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 123 | | Center for the Arts Expansion | 1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 127 | Bovey, City of | Project Summary | | 600 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 |
| 128 | | Infrastructure Capital Improvements | 1 | 600 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 |
| 133 | Brainerd, City of | Project Summary | | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 |
| 134 | | Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead | 1 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 |
| 140 | Buhl, City of | Project Summary | | 2,720 | 0 | 0 | 2,720 | 0 |
| 141 | | Buhl Water Infrastructure | 1 | 2,720 | 0 | 0 | 2,720 | 0 |
| 145 | Carver County | Project Summary | | 36,800 | 0 | 0 | 36,800 | 4,300 |
| 146 | | Highway 212 Carver County Expansion Project | 1 | 32,500 | 0 | 0 | 32,500 | 0 |
| 152 | | Waterfront Development for Waconia Regional Park | 2 | 4,300 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 4,300 |
| 158 | Carver, City of | Project Summary | | 11,058 | 0 | 0 | 11,058 | 0 |
| 159 | | Carver Levee | 1 | 11,058 | 0 | 0 | 11,058 | 0 |
| 163 | Cedar River Watershed District | Project Summary | | 2,350 | 0 | 0 | 2,350 | 0 |
| 164 | | Implementation of Cedar River Capital Investment Plan, Phase II | 1 | 2,350 | 0 | 0 | 2,350 | 0 |

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|------------|---|---|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 168 | Champlin, City of | Project Summary | | 6,051 | 0 | 0 | 6,051 | 0 |
| 169 | | Mississippi Crossings Park Improvement Project | 1 | 6,051 | 0 | 0 | 6,051 | 0 |
| 174 | Chanhasen, City of | Project Summary | | 729 | 0 | 0 | 729 | 0 |
| 175 | | Lyman Boulevard Improvements - Galpin Boulevard to West of Hwy 41 | 1 | 729 | 0 | 0 | 729 | 0 |
| 179 | Chaska, City of | Project Summary | | 6,040 | 0 | 0 | 6,040 | 0 |
| 180 | | Highway 41 Regional River Crossing and Historic Downtown Corridor Improvement Project | 1 | 6,040 | 0 | 0 | 6,040 | 0 |
| 188 | Chatfield Economic Development Authority | Project Summary | | 9,728 | 0 | 0 | 9,728 | 9,728 |
| 189 | | Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II | 1 | 9,728 | 0 | 0 | 9,728 | 9,728 |
| 194 | Chisago County | Project Summary | | 50,080 | 0 | 0 | 50,080 | 0 |
| 195 | | US Highway 8 - Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements | 1 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 |
| 200 | | Chisago County District Courts - Courtroom Sound System Replacement and Upgrade | 2 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 |
| 205 | Chisholm, City of | Project Summary | | 11,534 | 0 | 0 | 11,534 | 0 |
| 206 | | Public Safety Building | 1 | 8,922 | 0 | 0 | 8,922 | 0 |
| 210 | | Ice Arena and Curling Club | 2 | 2,612 | 0 | 0 | 2,612 | 0 |
| 215 | Cohasset, City of | Project Summary | | 2,850 | 0 | 0 | 2,850 | 2,850 |
| 216 | | Mississippi Riverfront Development | 1 | 2,850 | 0 | 0 | 2,850 | 2,850 |
| 222 | Collegeville Township | Project Summary | | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 |
| 223 | | Fruit Farm Road | 1 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 |
| 227 | Coon Rapids, City of | Project Summary | | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 2,250 |
| 228 | | Coon Creek Regional Trail and Pedestrian Bridge | 1 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 2,250 |
| 232 | Cottonwood, City of | Project Summary | | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 |
| 233 | | Sanitary Sewer System Rehabilitation | 1 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 |
| 237 | Crane Lake Township | Project Summary | | 6,600 | 0 | 0 | 6,600 | 6,600 |
| 238 | | Voyageurs National Park Visitor Center | 1 | 6,600 | 0 | 0 | 6,600 | 6,600 |
| 242 | Crystal, City of | Project Summary | | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 243 | | City of Crystal Police Department Expansion | 1 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 248 | Currie, City of | Project Summary | | 625 | 0 | 0 | 625 | 0 |
| 249 | | Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater | 1 | 625 | 0 | 0 | 625 | 0 |
| 253 | Dakota County | Project Summary | | 38,190 | 0 | 0 | 38,190 | 0 |
| 254 | | Public Safety and Greenway Improvements | 1 | 22,750 | 0 | 0 | 22,750 | 0 |
| 258 | | Regional Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Recycling Facility | 2 | 10,440 | 0 | 0 | 10,440 | 0 |
| 263 | | Veterans Memorial Greenway | 3 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 267 | Dassel-Cokato Public School District | Project Summary | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 268 | | Dassel-Cokato Regional Activity Center | 1 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 272 | Deer River, City of | Project Summary | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 273 | | Sewer and Water System Improvements | 1 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 277 | Duluth, City of | Project Summary | | 13,500 | 0 | 0 | 13,500 | 13,500 |
| 278 | | Duluth Coastal Infrastructure Rehabilitation - Lakewalk and Harbor Sea Walls | 1 | 13,500 | 0 | 0 | 13,500 | 13,500 |
| 285 | East Itasca Sewer JPB | Project Summary | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 0 |
| 286 | | East Itasca Joint Sewer Board Regional Water Treatment Facility | 1 | 750 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 0 |
| 291 | Ellsworth, City of | Project Summary | | 1,345 | 0 | 0 | 1,345 | 1,345 |
| 292 | | Ellsworth City Hall Multi-purpose Room and Public Works Shop | 1 | 1,345 | 0 | 0 | 1,345 | 1,345 |
| 296 | Ely, City of | Project Summary | | 2,800 | 0 | 0 | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| 297 | | Ely Regional Trailhead Construction | 1 | 2,800 | 0 | 0 | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| 303 | Eveleth, City of | Project Summary | | 1,020 | 0 | 0 | 1,020 | 1,020 |
| 304 | | City of Eveleth Public Buildings Improvements | 1 | 1,020 | 0 | 0 | 1,020 | 1,020 |
| 308 | Falcon Heights, City of | Project Summary | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 309 | | Community Park Building | 1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 315 | Faribault, City of | Project Summary | | 1,930 | 0 | 0 | 1,930 | 0 |
| 316 | | Water Reclamation Facility Flood Mitigation and Bank Stabilization Project | 1 | 1,930 | 0 | 0 | 1,930 | 0 |
| 320 | Fergus Falls, City of | Project Summary | | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 2,250 |
| 321 | | Fergus Falls Downtown Riverfront Improvements | 1 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 2,250 |
| 327 | Flensburg, City of | Project Summary | | 920 | 0 | 0 | 920 | 0 |

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|------|--|---|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 328 | | Sanitary Sewer System Reconstruction | 1 | 920 | 0 | 0 | 920 | 0 |
| 332 | Floodwood, City of | Project Summary | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 333 | | Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 341 | Foley, City of | Project Summary | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 342 | | Foley Wastewater Regionalization | 1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 347 | Forest Lake, City of | Project Summary | | 7,450 | 0 | 0 | 7,450 | 0 |
| 348 | | Highway 97 and Goodview Avenue Intersection Pedestrian Overpass | 1 | 3,200 | 0 | 0 | 3,200 | 0 |
| 353 | | North Shore Trail and Pedestrian Improvements | 2 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 |
| 357 | | Wastewater Infrastructure System Replacement and Repair | 3 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 |
| 361 | Gilbert, City of | Project Summary | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 362 | | Trailhead Hub | 1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 366 | Goodhue County | Project Summary | | 3,106 | 0 | 0 | 3,106 | 0 |
| 367 | | Cannon Valley Trail Storm Water Infrastructure Improvement and Trail Access Facilities Development | 1 | 3,106 | 0 | 0 | 3,106 | 0 |
| 373 | Grand Rapids, City of | Project Summary | | 5,488 | 0 | 0 | 5,488 | 5,488 |
| 374 | | Itasca Recreation Association (IRA) Civic Center | 1 | 5,488 | 0 | 0 | 5,488 | 5,488 |
| 379 | Hastings, City of | Project Summary | | 4,427 | 0 | 0 | 4,427 | 0 |
| 380 | | Hastings Historic Courthouse | 1 | 2,027 | 0 | 0 | 2,027 | 0 |
| 385 | | Highway 316 Improvements | 2 | 2,400 | 0 | 0 | 2,400 | 0 |
| 390 | Henderson, City of | Project Summary | | 16,500 | 0 | 0 | 16,500 | 0 |
| 391 | | Henderson Area Minnesota River Scenic Byway Highway Minnesota State Highway 93 Historic Flood 10 Ton Road Raise Project | 1 | 16,500 | 0 | 0 | 16,500 | 0 |
| 396 | Hennepin County | Project Summary | | 51,800 | 0 | 0 | 51,800 | 1,800 |
| 397 | | Highway 252 Freeway Conversion Between Highway 610 and I-694 | 1 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 | 0 |
| 402 | | Avivo (formerly Resource, Inc.) | 2 | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| 407 | Hibbing, City of | Project Summary | | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| 408 | | Hibbing Mine View "Windows to the World" | 1 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| 412 | Hoyt Lakes, City of | Project Summary | | 2,239 | 0 | 0 | 2,239 | 0 |
| 413 | | Hoyt Lakes Ice Arena Refrigeration System Replacement - Bleachers | 1 | 2,239 | 0 | 0 | 2,239 | 0 |
| 417 | Hutchinson, City of | Project Summary | | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 0 |
| 418 | | Campbell and Otter Lakes Restoration | 1 | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 0 |
| 422 | International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission | Project Summary | | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| 423 | | Runway and Taxiway Reconstruction | 1 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| 427 | Kandiyohi County | Project Summary | | 3,900 | 0 | 0 | 3,900 | 0 |
| 428 | | CSAH 55 Highway-rail Grade Separation | 1 | 3,900 | 0 | 0 | 3,900 | 0 |
| 432 | Koochiching County | Project Summary | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 |
| 433 | | CSAH 24 Overpass | 1 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 |
| 438 | Lake City, City of | Project Summary | | 3,368 | 96 | 0 | 3,464 | 2,703 |
| 439 | | Ohuta Beach Breakwater | 1 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 1,058 |
| 443 | | Roschen Park and Boat Ramp Breakwater | 2 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 1,058 |
| 447 | | Bank Restoration and Stabilization Along Lake Pepin | 3 | 311 | 0 | 0 | 311 | 0 |
| 451 | | Hok-Si-La Park Water and Sewer Extension | 4 | 587 | 0 | 0 | 587 | 587 |
| 455 | | Mississippi Blufflands Trail Engineering Study | 5 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 |
| 459 | | Roschen Park Parking Lot Reconstruction | 6 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 0 |
| 463 | | Lake City - Sportsmans Club Parking Lot and Waterfront Improvements | 7 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 |
| 467 | | Lake City Government Pier Structural Engineering Study | 8 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| 471 | | Riverwalk Trail Extension | 9 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 |
| 475 | | Recreational and Athletic Facilities near Roschen Park | 10 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 96 | 0 |
| 479 | Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System JPB | Project Summary | | 14,421 | 17,431 | 0 | 31,852 | 0 |
| 480 | | LPRW Dawson-Boyd Water Source | 1 | 14,421 | 17,431 | 0 | 31,852 | 0 |
| 486 | Litchfield, City of | Project Summary | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 487 | | Community Recreation Improvements | 1 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------------|---|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 491 | Little Falls, City of | Project Summary | | 6,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 12,000 | 0 |
| 492 | | TH 27 Memorial Bridge - Rail Grade Separation | 1 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 12,000 | 0 |
| 497 | Madison, City of | Project Summary | | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| 498 | | Madison Recreation and Activity Center | 1 | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 4,500 |
| 503 | Mahnomen, City of | Project Summary | | 3,626 | 0 | 0 | 3,626 | 0 |
| 504 | | Water and Sewer Infrastructure Project | 1 | 3,626 | 0 | 0 | 3,626 | 0 |
| 510 | Mankato, City of | Project Summary | | 16,535 | 0 | 0 | 16,535 | 16,535 |
| 511 | | Valley Opportunities | 1 | 12,385 | 0 | 0 | 12,385 | 12,385 |
| 516 | | Water Quality Mitigation | 2 | 4,150 | 0 | 0 | 4,150 | 4,150 |
| 520 | Maple Grove, City of | Project Summary | | 24,500 | 0 | 0 | 24,500 | 0 |
| 521 | | County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 610 Extension of TH 610 to CSAH 30 | 1 | 18,000 | 0 | 0 | 18,000 | 0 |
| 526 | | North Metro Range Regional Public Safety Training Facility Expansion | 2 | 6,500 | 0 | 0 | 6,500 | 0 |
| 531 | Marble, City of | Project Summary | | 905 | 0 | 0 | 905 | 0 |
| 532 | | City of Marble Water Tower | 1 | 905 | 0 | 0 | 905 | 0 |
| 536 | Martin County | Project Summary | | 20,300 | 0 | 0 | 20,300 | 300 |
| 537 | | Martin County Justice Center | 1 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 |
| 545 | | Martin County Veterans Memorial | 2 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 300 |
| 549 | McKinley, City of | Project Summary | | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 |
| 550 | | McKinley OHV Recreation Park | 1 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 250 | 0 |
| 554 | Melrose, City of | Project Summary | | 5,750 | 0 | 0 | 5,750 | 0 |
| 555 | | Melrose Wastewater Treatment Facility | 1 | 5,750 | 0 | 0 | 5,750 | 0 |
| 559 | Mendota, City of | Project Summary | | 1,210 | 0 | 0 | 1,210 | 0 |
| 560 | | Water Main Extension | 1 | 920 | 0 | 0 | 920 | 0 |
| 564 | | 2016 Land Slide | 2 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 0 |
| 568 | | Water Pressure Reducing Valve | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 |
| 572 | Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Project Summary | | 31,598 | 0 | 0 | 31,598 | 26,598 |
| 573 | | 26th Avenue North: Creating Connections in North Minneapolis | 1 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 577 | | Water Works Park | 2 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 582 | | Grand Rounds Missing Link Implementation | 3 | 12,348 | 0 | 0 | 12,348 | 12,348 |
| 586 | | North Commons Regional Vision | 4 | 11,250 | 0 | 0 | 11,250 | 11,250 |
| 590 | Minneapolis, City of | Project Summary | | 41,500 | 0 | 0 | 41,500 | 19,000 |
| 591 | | Upper Harbor Outdoor Music Performance Venue | 1 | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 20,000 | 0 |
| 596 | | Central City Storm Tunnel | 2 | 19,000 | 0 | 0 | 19,000 | 19,000 |
| 600 | | Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement | 3 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 |
| 605 | Moorhead, City of | Project Summary | | 67,055 | 11,500 | 0 | 78,555 | 9,500 |
| 606 | | 11th St Railroad Grade Separation | 1 | 57,555 | 0 | 0 | 57,555 | 0 |
| 612 | | Moorhead Community and Aquatics Center | 2 | 9,500 | 11,500 | 0 | 21,000 | 9,500 |
| 617 | Newport, City of | Project Summary | | 4,800 | 0 | 0 | 4,800 | 0 |
| 618 | | Sanitary Sewer Mainline Lining, Service Lining, and Manhole Sealing | 1 | 4,800 | 0 | 0 | 4,800 | 0 |
| 623 | Nobles County | Project Summary | | 16,000 | 0 | 0 | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| 624 | | WELL - Welcome, Education, Library, Livability | 1 | 16,000 | 0 | 0 | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| 630 | North Mankato, City of | Project Summary | | 10,500 | 0 | 0 | 10,500 | 10,500 |
| 631 | | Caswell Park Improvements | 1 | 10,500 | 0 | 0 | 10,500 | 10,500 |
| 637 | Northfield, City of | Project Summary | | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| 638 | | Regional Transit Hub | 1 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| 642 | Oak Park Heights, City of | Project Summary | | 794 | 0 | 0 | 794 | 0 |
| 643 | | Norell Ave and State Frontage Road - Realignment | 1 | 794 | 0 | 0 | 794 | 0 |
| 649 | Olmsted County | Project Summary | | 16,300 | 0 | 0 | 16,300 | 12,500 |
| 650 | | Graham Park Regional Multi-Use Expo Building | 1 | 12,500 | 0 | 0 | 12,500 | 12,500 |
| 655 | | Proposed Interchange at County Road 104 and Trunk Highway 14 - Engineering and Right of Way Acquisition (Phase I) | 2 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 |
| 659 | | Material Recovery Facility - Design Phase | 3 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 |
| 664 | Oronoco, City of | Project Summary | | 20,384 | 0 | 0 | 20,384 | 0 |
| 665 | | Oronoco Wastewater System | 1 | 20,384 | 0 | 0 | 20,384 | 0 |
| 675 | Otter Tail County | Project Summary | | 1,978 | 0 | 0 | 1,978 | 1,978 |
| 676 | | Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail | 1 | 1,978 | 0 | 0 | 1,978 | 1,978 |
| 681 | Pine County | Project Summary | | 650 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 650 |
| 682 | | Oberstar Trail Segment | 1 | 650 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 650 |

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|--|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 686 | Plymouth, City of | Project Summary | | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 687 | | Plymouth Creek Center | 1 | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| 693 | Prairie Lake Youth JPB | Project Summary | | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 1,058 |
| 694 | | School and Recreation Center | 1 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 1,058 |
| 698 | Proctor, City of | Project Summary | | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 699 | | Multi-use Government Center | 1 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| 703 | Ramsey County | Project Summary | | 86,757 | 0 | 0 | 86,757 | 9,257 |
| 704 | | Riverfront Property - Riversedge Land Lid | 1 | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 40,000 | 0 |
| 708 | | Ramsey and Washington County Recycling and Energy Center Next Generation Technology Upgrades | 2 | 21,000 | 0 | 0 | 21,000 | 0 |
| 718 | | Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area | 3 | 2,127 | 0 | 0 | 2,127 | 2,127 |
| 722 | | Interstate Highway 35E and County Road J Interchange | 4 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| 726 | | Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project | 5 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 |
| 730 | | Riverview Corridor | 6 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 |
| 734 | | Twin Cities Milwaukee Chicago Second Train | 7 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 738 | | Gibbs Farm - Pathways to Dakota and Pioneer Life Program Expansion | 8 | 7,130 | 0 | 0 | 7,130 | 7,130 |
| 745 | Ranier, City of | Project Summary | | 917 | 0 | 0 | 917 | 0 |
| 746 | | Ranier Safe Harbor - Transient Dock on Rainy Lake | 1 | 917 | 0 | 0 | 917 | 0 |
| 750 | Red Rock Rural Water System | Project Summary | | 5,850 | 0 | 0 | 5,850 | 0 |
| 751 | | Lakes Area Regional Expansion Project | 1 | 5,850 | 0 | 0 | 5,850 | 0 |
| 757 | Red Wing, City of | Project Summary | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 3,900 |
| 758 | | Old West Main Street Reconstruction and Riverfront Pedestrian - Bicycle Bridge connection | 1 | 2,100 | 0 | 0 | 2,100 | 1,000 |
| 763 | | Mississippi Blufflands State Trail – Red Wing Riverfront Trail – He Mni Can-Barn Bluff Regional Park to Colvill Park | 2 | 900 | 0 | 0 | 900 | 900 |
| 768 | | Upper Harbor - Bay Point Renewal | 3 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 772 | Redwood Falls, City of | Project Summary | | 2,128 | 0 | 0 | 2,128 | 0 |
| 773 | | Redwood Falls Municipal Airport Runway and Lighting Replacement | 1 | 2,128 | 0 | 0 | 2,128 | 0 |
| 778 | Rice Lake, City of | Project Summary | | 2,009 | 0 | 0 | 2,009 | 0 |
| 779 | | Rice Lake Sewer and Water Extension | 1 | 2,009 | 0 | 0 | 2,009 | 0 |
| 783 | Richfield, City of | Project Summary | | 7,000 | 0 | 0 | 7,000 | 0 |
| 784 | | 77th Street Trunk Highway 77 Underpass | 1 | 7,000 | 0 | 0 | 7,000 | 0 |
| 789 | Rochester, City of | Project Summary | | 18,250 | 0 | 0 | 18,250 | 2,750 |
| 790 | | Rochester International Airport (RST) Runway Safety Improvements | 1 | 9,000 | 0 | 0 | 9,000 | 0 |
| 794 | | Silver Lake Dam Modifications and Improvements | 2 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 798 | | Cascade Lake Park Improvements | 3 | 2,750 | 0 | 0 | 2,750 | 2,750 |
| 802 | | Willow Creek Trail Connection Project | 4 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 |
| 806 | Rockville, City of | Project Summary | | 1,370 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 1,370 |
| 807 | | Rocori Trail Phase 3 | 1 | 1,370 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 1,370 |
| 811 | Rogers, City of | Project Summary | | 2,200 | 0 | 0 | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| 812 | | Rogers I-94 Pedestrian Overpass | 1 | 2,200 | 0 | 0 | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| 817 | Roseville, City of | Project Summary | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 818 | | Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL | 1 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 824 | Scandia, City of | Project Summary | | 1,250 | 2,250 | 1,100 | 4,600 | 1,250 |
| 825 | | Gateway State Trail Extension | 1 | 1,250 | 2,250 | 1,100 | 4,600 | 1,250 |
| 830 | Scott County | Project Summary | | 29,230 | 0 | 0 | 29,230 | 0 |
| 831 | | Open Library Project at Savage Library | 1 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 |
| 835 | | Merriam Junction Trail | 2 | 9,000 | 0 | 0 | 9,000 | 0 |
| 840 | | County Highway 42 Expansion | 4 | 5,625 | 0 | 0 | 5,625 | 0 |
| 844 | | Trunk Highway (TH) 13 and Dakota and Yosemite Interchange - Local Road Improvements | 5 | 5,269 | 0 | 0 | 5,269 | 0 |
| 848 | | US Highway 169, TH 282, and CH 9 Interchange - Local Road Improvements | 6 | 9,277 | 0 | 0 | 9,277 | 0 |
| 852 | Shakopee, City of | Project Summary | | 13,975 | 4,113 | 0 | 18,088 | 13,915 |
| 853 | | US 169 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpass | 1 | 2,162 | 0 | 0 | 2,162 | 2,162 |
| 858 | | Scott County Innovation Center | 2 | 60 | 4,113 | 0 | 4,173 | 0 |
| 863 | | Cultural Corridor with Minnesota Riverbank Stabilization and Access - Shakopee | 3 | 11,753 | 0 | 0 | 11,753 | 11,753 |

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|-------------|--|---|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 869 | Shell Rock River Watershed District | Project Summary | | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 7,500 | 0 |
| 870 | | Fountain Lake Restoration Phase 2 | 1 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 7,500 | 0 |
| 875 | Silver Bay, City of | Project Summary | | 1,900 | 0 | 0 | 1,900 | 1,900 |
| 876 | | Multimodal Trailhead Center | 1 | 1,900 | 0 | 0 | 1,900 | 1,900 |
| 882 | South Haven, City of | Project Summary | | 773 | 0 | 0 | 773 | 0 |
| 883 | | South Haven Water System Improvements | 1 | 773 | 0 | 0 | 773 | 0 |
| 888 | South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB | Project Summary | | 5,700 | 0 | 0 | 5,700 | 0 |
| 889 | | Expand Small Range for Qualifications | 1 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 893 | | Large Shooting Range Updates | 2 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 897 | | Shooting Range HVAC System | 3 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 901 | | Fire Tower Equipment | 4 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 |
| 905 | | Expansion of Defensive Tactics Gym | 5 | 700 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 0 |
| 909 | | Trench Collapse Simulator | 6 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 |
| 913 | | Tactical Training Structure | 7 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 |
| 917 | South St. Paul, City of | Project Summary | | 6,700 | 0 | 0 | 6,700 | 2,366 |
| 918 | | Concord Street (State Highway 156) Utilities | 1 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 2,366 |
| 923 | | Doug Woog Arena HVAC | 2 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 350 | 0 |
| 928 | | Renovation of Lysdale Hangar at Fleming Field | 3 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 350 | 0 |
| 932 | Spring Park, City of | Project Summary | | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 933 | | Spring Park Critical Infrastructure | 1 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 939 | St. Cloud, City of | Project Summary | | 12,150 | 0 | 0 | 12,150 | 12,150 |
| 940 | | St. Cloud Municipal Athletic Complex Expansion and Renovation | 1 | 12,150 | 0 | 0 | 12,150 | 12,150 |
| 945 | St. Joseph, City of | Project Summary | | 4,300 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 4,300 |
| 946 | | Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center | 1 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 952 | | East Park | 2 | 300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 300 |
| 957 | St. Louis & Lake Counties RRA | Project Summary | | 31,000 | 0 | 0 | 31,000 | 0 |
| 958 | | Northern Lights Express Intercity Passenger Rail | 1 | 31,000 | 0 | 0 | 31,000 | 0 |
| 963 | St. Louis County | Project Summary | | 11,015 | 0 | 0 | 11,015 | 2,765 |
| 964 | | St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center | 1 | 8,250 | 0 | 0 | 8,250 | 0 |
| 969 | | Clarity Behavioral Health Crisis Facility | 2 | 1,365 | 0 | 0 | 1,365 | 1,365 |
| 973 | | Voyageur Country ATV Trail System Expansion | 3 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 977 | | St. Louis County Fairground Buildings | 4 | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 400 |
| 981 | St. Louis Park, City of | Project Summary | | 4,900 | 0 | 0 | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| 982 | | Seed the Change - Perspectives Capital Improvements | 1 | 4,900 | 0 | 0 | 4,900 | 4,900 |
| 987 | St. Martin, City of | Project Summary | | 1,158 | 0 | 0 | 1,158 | 0 |
| 988 | | CR 12 Utility and Sidewalk Improvements | 1 | 1,158 | 0 | 0 | 1,158 | 0 |
| 992 | St. Paul, City of | Project Summary | | 81,850 | 24,800 | 0 | 106,650 | 15,750 |
| 993 | | Third Street Kellogg Boulevard Bridge | 1 | 55,000 | 0 | 0 | 55,000 | 0 |
| 999 | | EastBound Kellogg Boulevard RiverCentre Bridge | 2 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 |
| 1004 | | Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center | 3 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| 1009 | | Como Park Zoo | 4 | 2,500 | 13,500 | 0 | 16,000 | 2,500 |
| 1013 | | International Institute | | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 5,500 | 5,500 |
| 1018 | | Minnesota Humanities Center | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 750 |
| 1023 | | Playwrights' Center | | 1,100 | 2,900 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 |
| 1028 | | Victoria Theater Arts | | 2,400 | 0 | 0 | 2,400 | 2,400 |
| 1033 | | YMCA | | 1,600 | 8,400 | 0 | 10,000 | 1,600 |
| 1039 | Staples, City of | Project Summary | | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| 1040 | | Batcher Block Opera House Restoration | 1 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| 1045 | Steele County | Project Summary | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 0 |
| 1046 | | Steele County Fair Electrical Project | 1 | 750 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 0 |
| 1050 | Stillwater, City of | Project Summary | | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 |
| 1051 | | Historic Bergstein Buildings Rehabilitation Project | 1 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 800 | 0 |
| 1055 | Thief River Falls Regional Airport Authority | Project Summary | | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 6,750 | 0 |
| 1056 | | Cargo Aircraft Hangar | 1 | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 6,750 | 0 |
| 1061 | Three Rivers Park District | Project Summary | | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| 1062 | | Mississippi Gateway Regional Park | 1 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 8,500 |
| 1069 | Tower, City of | Project Summary | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 |

Table of Contents
2020 Governor's Local Government Capital Budget Recommendations

| Page | Entity | Project Title | Priority | \$ in Thousands | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| | | | | 2020 Request Amount | 2022 Request Amount | 2024 Request Amount | Total Request Amount | 2020 Gov Rec |
| 1070 | | Water Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 |
| 1074 | Traverse County | Project Summary | | 5,100 | 0 | 0 | 5,100 | 0 |
| 1075 | | County Courthouse | 1 | 5,100 | 0 | 0 | 5,100 | 0 |
| 1080 | Twin Lakes Township | Project Summary | | 10,400 | 0 | 0 | 10,400 | 0 |
| 1081 | | Twin Lakes Township Water Distribution System | 1 | 10,400 | 0 | 0 | 10,400 | 0 |
| 1086 | Two Harbors, City of | Project Summary | | 11,341 | 0 | 0 | 11,341 | 0 |
| 1087 | | Two Harbors Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | 11,341 | 0 | 0 | 11,341 | 0 |
| 1091 | Tyler, City of | Project Summary | | 4,444 | 0 | 0 | 4,444 | 0 |
| 1092 | | Trunk Sanitary Sewer Improvements | 1 | 4,444 | 0 | 0 | 4,444 | 0 |
| 1097 | Vernon Center, City of | Project Summary | | 7,984 | 0 | 0 | 7,984 | 0 |
| 1098 | | Water Infrastructure Improvements | 1 | 7,984 | 0 | 0 | 7,984 | 0 |
| 1104 | Virginia, City of | Project Summary | | 10,390 | 0 | 0 | 10,390 | 10,390 |
| 1105 | | Regional Fire-Based Emergency Medical Services and Public Safety Facility | 1 | 10,390 | 0 | 0 | 10,390 | 10,390 |
| 1109 | Warren, City of | Project Summary | | 435 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 0 |
| 1110 | | PV Installation and Solar Energy Learning Center | 1 | 435 | 0 | 0 | 435 | 0 |
| 1114 | Washington County | Project Summary | | 21,000 | 0 | 0 | 21,000 | 2,500 |
| 1115 | | Trunk Highway 36 and CSAH 15 (Manning Avenue) Interchange Project | 1 | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 15,000 | 0 |
| 1120 | | 4th Street Bridge with Metro Gold Line in Oakdale | 2 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 |
| 1124 | | Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park Lower Landing Project | 3 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| 1129 | | St. Croix Bluffs Regional Park Boat Launch | 4 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 500 |
| 1134 | Wayzata, City of | Project Summary | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 1135 | | Wayzata Lake Effect Boardwalk Project | 1 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 1140 | West St. Paul, City of | Project Summary | | 1,637 | 2,312 | 0 | 3,949 | 0 |
| 1141 | | Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Station 1 | 1 | 1,237 | 0 | 0 | 1,237 | 0 |
| 1145 | | Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Stations and Forcemains | 2 | 400 | 2,312 | 0 | 2,712 | 0 |
| 1149 | Western Lake Superior Sanitary Dist | Project Summary | | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 6,750 | 0 |
| 1150 | | WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy System: Engine Generators | 1 | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 6,750 | 0 |
| 1155 | Windom, City of | Project Summary | | 365 | 0 | 0 | 365 | 0 |
| 1156 | | Red Leaf Court Storm Sewer | 1 | 365 | 0 | 0 | 365 | 0 |
| 1160 | Winona County | Project Summary | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| 1161 | | Winona County Jail | 1 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 |
| Total Local Government Requests with Recommendations | | | | 1,325,643 | 77,502 | 3,100 | 1,406,245 | 363,616 |
| MN Public Television Appropriation Bonds | | | | | | | | 15,000 |
| Equity Projects General Fund Cash | | | | | | | | 30,000 |
| Grand Total Local Government Governor's Recommendations | | | | | | | | \$408,616 |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Flood Mitigation for East Main Street - US Trunk Highway 65 | 1 | THB | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Blazing Star Trail | 2 | GO | 1,750 | 0 | 0 | 1,750 | 0 | 0 |
| Blazing Star Landing | 3 | GF | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 25,250 | 0 | 0 | 5,250 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 3,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,750 | 0 | 0 | 1,750 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Flood Mitigation for East Main Street - US Trunk Highway 65**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$3,500**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The flood mitigation project involves raising the roadway above flood levels or installation of large stormwater pumps to keep flood levels lower than the roadway.

US Trunk Highway 65 is a State Highway in downtown Albert Lea that carries over 10,000 vehicles per day. This roadway experiences both short term and long term flooding events regularly. This results in safety issues, traffic disruption, and has a negative economic impact on the local businesses, community and traveling public.

Project Description

In 1952 MNDOT constructed a portion of US Highway 65 (US 65) between Fountain Lake and Albert Lea Lake in downtown Albert Lea, Minnesota. This four lane divided highway is now the primary east west corridor through Albert Lea and carries over 10,000 vehicles per day. This section of roadway has been prone to both short term flooding and long duration flooding since installation. These events occur several times per year and have been a constant hardship for the Albert Lea community. These flooding events on US 65 create a safety hazard for motorists, forcing US 65 closures that ranged in duration from a few hours to several days. These road closures require emergency action to erect barricades and re-route through-traffic from US 65 to alternate routes. These flood events limit access to local businesses during flooding events. Over the years the City of Albert Lea has worked with FEMA to purchase and relocate businesses and homeowners in this low area. In 2018 MNDOT and the City of Albert Lea hired Barr Engineering to perform an evaluation of potential mitigation measures that could reduce future flooding frequency and duration. This study was in anticipation of a 2021 MNDOT mill and overlay project.

The area that frequently floods is an approximately 1,200 foot flood-prone portion of US 65 that lies entirely within Albert Lea, in Freeborn County, Minnesota, bounded to the west by Lake Avenue and to the east by Katherine Street.

The proposed mitigation will involve raising the roadway above flood levels or installation of large stormwater pumps to keep flood levels lower than the roadway or a combination of both.

Project Rationale

This flood mitigation project would eliminate the closure of US Trunk Highway 65. This will improve safety, eliminate traffic disruptions and improve commerce.

Project Timeline

It is anticipated that this project would occur as part of or concurrently with a MNDOT Mill and Overlay project that is currently scheduled for 2021.

Other Considerations

This project has broad community support and is currently supported by the City of Albert Lea, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Freeborn County, Shell Rock River Watershed District, and the business community.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project would be a benefit to the Minnesota Department of Transportation who is the owner of US TH-65.

Who will own the facility?

There are currently two options being evaluated. If the road raise option is chosen, MNDOT would remain the owner of the roadway. If a stormwater pumping station option is chosen, the City would own and operate this facility.

Who will operate the facility?

There are currently two options being evaluated. If the road raise option is chosen, MNDOT would remain the owner of the roadway. If a stormwater pumping station option is chosen, the City would own and operate this facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The traveling public will benefit from this project.

Public Purpose

This project eliminates safety issues, traffic disruption, has a positive economic impact on local businesses, community and traveling public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This project has not previously been funded.

Project Contact Person

Jerry Gabrielatos
Acting City Manager
507-377-4300
jgabriellatos@ci.albertlea.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$3.5 million in trunk highway bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Flood Mitigation for East Main Street - US Trunk Highway 65

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$780 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$3,120 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$61 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,639 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Blazing Star Trail

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,750

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: The broader Albert Lea community is requesting the completion of the Blazing Star State Trail from Albert Lea to Hayward, MN, which was legislatively authorized in 1996. The project also received \$1.5 million in 2005 bonding appropriations that was intended to complete the entire project. However, due to numerous project delays and studies, the original \$1.5 million in bonding appropriations have been expended and approximately \$2.7 million is now needed to complete the project.

Project Description

The remaining project work for the Blazing Star State Trail includes construction of two embankments, a 100-foot pedestrian bridge, and associated trail work. The location of the project is a channel between the north bay and main body of Albert Lea Lake and parallel to an active rail line. The completed trail would provide transportation for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation. Myre-Big Island State Park already receives over 113,000 annual visits and is expected to increase with the completion of this bridge and remaining gap project. When ultimately completed, the Blazing Star State Trail will connect Albert Lea, Myre-Big Island State Park, Hayward and Austin as part of the emerging Southeast Minnesota regional trail network. A Joint Powers Board was created over two decades ago to guide the development and maintenance of the trail.

Project Rationale

To complete the trail connection from Myre-Big Island State Park to Hayward, as originally intended from the 2005 bonding appropriations, which has been unfortunately delayed numerous times beyond the control of local jurisdictions. This unfinished gap greatly reduces the use and purpose of the trail.

This project will bolster the city and county's reputation as the Recreational Capital of Southern Minnesota. Earlier this year, Albert Lea hosted the Governor's Fishing Opener. It was the first time since 1987 that the event was held on a lake in Southern Minnesota. Albert Lea Lake is already recognized as a premier destination for hiking and birding. This amenity will increase the attraction to this destination.

Project Timeline

After TAP funding is released in October of 2022, construction is expected to begin.

Other Considerations

This is a top project for the DNR. This request is being submitted by the City as a substitute if the DNR is unable to move the project forward.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None expected.

Who will own the facility?

State of Minnesota

Who will operate the facility?

There is a Joint Powers Board consisting of members from Albert Lea, Hayward and Austin. However, it is expected that the DNR will be operating the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Trail users throughout the local communities, region, State of Minnesota, and tourists from throughout the nation.

Public Purpose

Recreation and transportation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$1.5 million of bonding appropriation in 2005 was used to complete land acquisition and title work, geotechnical work, design and construction engineering, historical and archaeological investigation, and partial trail construction (only a bridge and associate trail work in Myre-Big Island State Park was completed in 2005).

Project Contact Person

Jerry Gabrielatos
Acting City Manager
507-377-4330
jgabrielatos@ci.albertlea.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.75 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Blazing Star Trail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$960 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,750 | \$960 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,675 | \$960 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,750 | \$960 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Blazing Star Landing

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$20,000

Priority Ranking: 3

Project Summary: \$20 million is being requested to provide redevelopment and renewal of the former Farmland Foods site deriving from a plant fire closing in 2001 that resulted in a severe economic blow to the community. The funding requested will create a recreational hub to the State Blazing Star Trail and new State Water Trail in the community; and, will serve as a regional wellness, recreational, educational, and event center benefitting the region’s economy through job creation and enhanced tourism.

Project Description

The Blazing Star Landing site is located in the heart of Albert Lea, between our two primary lakes: Albert Lea Lake and Fountain Lake. Albert Lea is located at the crossroads of two Interstates 35 and 90. The site served as a meat packing plant from 1912 to 2001, until a fire destroyed the facility and the Farmland industry decided not to rebuild in Albert Lea. The City acquired the land in 2004 after clean-up of the site and has had a variety of renditions for concept development on the site. Over the past few years, two community surveys have been conducted that support the proposed uses of the Blazing Star site and a group of volunteers/leaders from the Blandin Leadership program have helped engage key community stakeholders and the public in creating a master plan for the site. Key community stakeholders include the City of Albert Lea, Albert Lea Public School District 241, Senior Resources of Freeborn County, the Albert Lea YMCA, and representatives of the Blandin Leadership program. Several other non-profits have been engaged in community meetings that will likely utilize and benefit from the site and facilities. The site consists of approximately 62 acres and will incorporate key principles identified by the community, including:

- a mix of uses that support and compliment downtown Albert Lea, such as a hotel/convention center, mid-density to high density housing, office or destination oriented retail;
- iconic architecture and site design that maximizes views to and from the lakes and downtown;
- a site design pattern that serves as a focal point of connection between Fountain Lake, Albert Lea Lake, the Blazing Star Trail, the adjacent State Water Trail, and other recreational and pedestrian connections;
- an ecologically friendly design that protects water quality;
- an area that is “public” in its appearance and predominant patter of land use.

The construction of a new 98,400 square foot regional center will ensure that the public is provided the opportunity to use the site and its various educational, recreational, wellness/health, civic, social resources and services, as well as community or private meetings and functions. The proposed design includes space for aquatics, a gymnasium, fitness, child care, a senior center, and community space.

Project Rationale

The Blazing Star Landing property has been sitting idle since the 2001 Farmland Foods fire and plant closing. Private redevelopment and renewal of the site is not economically feasible without the collaboration of local, regional, and state authorities. Site work is needed to remove some contaminated soils that remain from the Farmland site closing, but as well to move a road that will allow for more public and private accessibility to recreate on Albert Lea Lake, which is the first lake of Minnesota's over 10,000 lakes that residents traveling north on Interstate 35 see and experience. The project is also needed to add tax base, jobs, and tourism to our local economy that will benefit regional and State tourism and economy's. Albert Lea has a strong agricultural and manufacturing industry, but desires to diversify our economy through enhanced tourism that will be generated through the Blazing Star Landing project. The Blazing Star Landing is the only remaining site in the community that can connect the Blazing Star Trail through Myre Big Island State Park with the newly designated State Water Trail, in addition to local recreational trails and destinations. The Blazing Star Landing will serve as a regional event center through a collaboration of public, private, and non-profit entities.

Project Timeline

Currently, staff is soliciting interest from private developers for the site.

Summer 2019 - Final site layout, floor plan and renderings completed.

Summer 2020 - Final Plans/Bids

Fall 2020 - Project Site Work Begins

Fall 2021 - Project Completion

During 2019-2020, the relocation of Front Street, to facilitate private development, could take place.

Other Considerations

The City and EDA have identified two private developers who have expressed interest in the site as a whole. City and EDA Staff intend to meet with an experienced consultancy about further recruitment of development of the site.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of Albert Lea will own the Blazing Star Center facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Albert Lea will contract with the Albert Lea YMCA and Albert Lea School District Community Education to operate the Blazing Star Center facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Albert Lea YMCA and Senior Resources of Freeborn County are both 501(c)3 non-profits that serve families and seniors respectively in Albert Lea and the surrounding region. They both plan to occupy space in the Blazing Star Community Center to provide services to the region. The Albert Lea School District Community Education program would work with the City and other agencies in the Center to provide enhanced educational programs and opportunities to the community.

Public Purpose

The project will provide a variety of educational, recreational, and public services to the region surrounding Albert Lea. The redevelopment and renewal of the site will improve the water quality entering Albert Lea Lake and remediate contaminated soils on the site. The project will serve as a connecting hub to the State's Blazing Star Trail and newly designated State Water Trail within the Shell Rock River Watershed District. The project will enhance tourism and serve as a regional event center for southern and southeastern Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not Applicable

Project Contact Person

Jerry Gabrielatos
Acting City Manager
507-377-4330
jgabrieltos@ci.albertlea.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Blazing Star Landing

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$550 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$8,405 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$42,455 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$45 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,590 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$35,370 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$1,095 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$3,355 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$42,455 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | No |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Runestone Community Center Expansion | 1 | GO | 5,600 | 0 | 0 | 5,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,600 | 0 | 0 | 5,600 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,600 | 0 | 0 | 5,600 | 0 | 0 |

Runestone Community Center Expansion

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$5,600 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | The City of Alexandria is requesting \$5,600,000 in state funds in order to design and construct an expansion of the Runestone Community Center. |

Project Description

The proposed expansion of the Runestone Community Center (RCC) will add approximately 44,000 square feet to the existing 76,000 square foot facility. The total cost of the expansion is estimated to be approximately \$11,200,000 at the time of proposed construction. The expansion will consist of a new floor area that will accommodate both dry floor and ice events. The plan is for restrooms and locker room areas to be underneath the seating area in order to maximize space. Other new space includes lobby areas, viewing areas, administrative space, and an elevator to improve accessibility throughout the site. Exterior work includes an expanded parking area and improved drainage for the site. The City will also be submitting a notice of interest to the Hazard Mitigation Assistance Program. The goal is to construct the facility in such a way that it would qualify as a designated community safe room or storm shelter.

The City has made substantial recent investments to maintain the infrastructure of the facility. The ice plant was converted to a high efficiency ammonia-based system in 2016. The new compressor room was sized to accommodate at least three ice sheets and the underground infrastructure to serve a third floor was extended as part of the 2016 renovation. Other renovations in 2016 included a new floor for the West Rink, new roof for the 1978 main building, and the installation of LED lighting throughout the facility. The city also invested in an ice cover which will allow for much greater flexibility in changing the facility from ice to dry floor events. In 2018, the City reconstructed and paved a portion of the parking lot for the RCC and the adjacent Douglas County Fairgrounds. This partnership between the City and the Douglas County Agricultural Association improved site drainage in addition to providing well-defined and safe parking areas. Finally, the City recently updated pre-design work completed in 2016 to reflect current construction costs and the impact of recent work at the RCC on the expansion budget.

The capital request is for the state to fund half of the expansion cost with local sources funding the remaining half of the project. Local sources would be a mixture of public and private funding.

Project Rationale

The RCC has served as a gathering place for West Central Minnesota since its opening in 1978, drawing athletes and event attendees from across the state. The original facility was constructed with one floor area that contains fixed and removable seating accommodating 1,600 spectators. A second floor was added in 1994. Both floors are used for ice and dry floor events. The City constructed a link between the two buildings that opened in 1996 which includes a lobby, concession area, office space, locker rooms, restrooms, and zamboni room.

It is estimated that over 20,000 people annually attend dry floor events at the RCC, drawing visitors from throughout the region. Dry floor events include a vendor show for a local company, home and garden expo, Alexandria Technical and Community College graduation, music concerts, and more. Thousands more attend the games, tournaments, competitions, and exhibitions sponsored by Alexandria Area High School, Alexandria Area Hockey Association, Alexandria Figure Skating Club, Vikingland Curling Club, and Alexandria Blizzard.

Continued growth in programming over the past decade led to the consideration of a facility expansion. The Alexandria Events Center Feasibility and Market Study was completed in November 2013. The chosen scenario from this study estimated that the expansion would create \$1,206,000 in new spending annually and a \$71,800 fiscal impact to the tax base of the area. A needs assessment completed in 2014 showed that ice user groups could increase their programming if the facility expanded. The need has only continued to grow since 2014. The high demand for facility time has made it difficult to expand existing events and add new dry floor events.

Project Timeline

July 2020-September 2020 - Update Pre-Design

October 2020-March 2021 - Preparation of Design and Construction Documents

May 2021-March 2022 - Construction

Other Considerations

The RCC sits adjacent to the Douglas County Fairgrounds and is utilized during the Douglas County Fair. The City and the Douglas County Agricultural Association (DCAA) completed work in 2017 on a Fairgrounds Master Plan, which provided a future blueprint for enhancing the regional impact of the entire 100+ acre area. Possible improvements identified in the Master Plan include renovations to the fair facilities, additional civic and recreational facilities, and new street and utility infrastructure. Since 2017, a task force consisting of City and DCAA representatives have continued to meet regularly. The task force is currently working on platting the entire fairgrounds site, which is the next step in the future redevelopment of the site. State investment in the expansion of the RCC could assist in leveraging additional redevelopment of the fairgrounds.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City will not be requesting any state operating dollars for the project. The City will continue to operate the Runestone Community Center as a department of the City.

Who will own the facility?

City of Alexandria

Who will operate the facility?

City of Alexandria

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Existing users expected to continue in the expanded RCC include the Alexandria Area Hockey Association, Alexandria Area High School, Alexandria Figure Skating Club, Alexandria Blizzard, and Vikingland Curling Club.

The City also intends to provide more opportunity for the facility to be used for dry floor events. Dry floor events expected to continue include a home and garden expo, food vendor, craft, and motorcycle

shows. Concerts and commencements also take place in the facility along with several educational events for elementary school children.

Public Purpose

The expansion of the Runestone Community Center will provide for greater opportunities for recreational, civic, and social activities for residents of West Central Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Martin Schultz
City Administrator
320-759-3629
mschultz@alexandriamn.city

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$5.6 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Runestone Community Center Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$5,611 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,211 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$650 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$1,211 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,211 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Trunk Highways 24 and 55 Road and Infrastructure Improvements | 1 | GO | 4,559 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,559 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,559 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highways 24 and 55 Road and Water Infrastructure Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$4,559**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Annandale is requesting \$4,559,000 in state funds in order to replace critical sewer and water infrastructure and complete traffic lane and intersection improvements in conjunction with MnDot projects in the year 2020 and 2022.**Project Description**

The City of Annandale has a dire need to upgrade and repair critical street, sewer and water infrastructure along Trunk Highway 24 and Trunk Highway 55 within the City of Annandale. The existing public utilities are 100 years old and with increasing volumes of traffic on Highway 55, traffic lane and intersection improvements are necessary to provide for a safe corridor for vehicles and pedestrians.

In 2020 and 2022, MnDot is slated to undergo two large-scale highway projects in the City, which will necessitate reconstruction of city infrastructure. The 2020 MnDot work includes a reconstruct of TH 24 between Highway 55 and Park Street, and an overlay of TH 24 between Oak Avenue and Poplar Avenue. In 2022, the MnDot work includes an overlay of Highway 55.

In order to save costs and prevent unnecessary replacement of street infrastructure, the city plans to do the local improvements in conjunction with MnDot work. The total city costs for both projects is \$8,610,000 which includes \$7,226,000 for streets, \$771,000 for sanitary sewer, \$1,014,000 for water, \$294,000 for storm improvements. Unfortunately, the timing of these projects does not financially align well with the City's current debt obligations. In order to fund existing state mandates, the City of Annandale already has high utility rates and high debt loads.

Project Rationale

As the T.H. 24 and T.H. 55 projects are being implemented by MNDOT, the City is required to meet the State's timeline for implementation which is 2020 and 2022 respectively. If the City of Annandale is required to finance 100% of the projects outlined above (20-year term/4% interest), it will result in a 42% increase to local property taxes, 152% increase to storm sewer rates, a 15% increase to water rates, and a 5% increase to sanitary sewer rates which are already extremely high by state standards.

In 2008 the City was required to replace its wastewater treatment facility due to phosphorus limitations imposed by MPCA. The City was ultimately required to construct a multi-city wastewater treatment facility and incur a loan of \$16,036,613 which represents debt per capita of over \$4,800. As credit rating agencies categorize \$5,000 in debt per capita as "High", the City ultimately had its credit rating downgraded which increased the cost of borrowing for other community projects.

An average Annandale resident presently pays 35% more per month for sanitary sewer than those communities at the high end of the affordability standards used by the State and Federal government,

and that does not include the local tax levy related support that the City has supplied to the system in recent years. Additionally, MPCA has notified the City that even more rigorous phosphorus standards will be imposed on the community which will require an additional \$13 million in investment in the wastewater treatment facility within the next 10 years.

Project Timeline

Project Timeline for 2020 Improvements- TH 24

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Project Design Completion | January 2019 |
| Approve Plans | September 2019 |
| Bid Opening | November 2019 |
| Accept Bids and Award Contract | January 2020 |
| Construction | May 2020 - November 2020 |
| Final Project Completion | June 2021 |

Project Timeline for 2022 Improvements- TH 55

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Project Design Completion | January 2021 |
| Approve Plans | June 2021 |
| Bid Opening | November 2021 |
| Accept Bids and Award Contract | January 2022 |
| Construction | May 2022 - November 2022 |
| Final Project Completion | June 2023 |

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City will not need or seek additional state subsidies to operate or maintain the utilities for which funding is being sought.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Annandale will own the sewer and water infrastructure. The State of Minnesota will own the street and storm utility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Annandale will operate and maintain the sewer and water infrastructure. The State of Minnesota will operate and maintain the street and stormwater improvements.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The sewer and water infrastructure will be used by the sanitary sewer, storm and water utility users within the City. The street will be used by the general public.

Public Purpose

The sewer, water and storm utilities provide critical sewer and water services to residents and businesses with the City of Annandale. The proposed street, traffic lane and intersection improvements on TH 55 will provide a safer corridor for vehicles and pedestrians using TH 55.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City has not received previous appropriations.

Project Contact Person

Kelly Hinnenkamp
City Administrator
320-274-3055
khinnenkamp@annandale.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highways 24 and 55 Road and Water Infrastructure Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,559 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$4,747 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$9,306 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,610 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$696 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$9,306 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| U.S. Highway 10 - Adding One Lane | 1 | THB | 17,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway 47 Railroad Grade Separation | 2 | THB | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TH 65 Grade Separation at 109th Avenue | 3 | GO | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway 610 Full-Access Interchange at East River Road | 4 | GO | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 30,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 27,600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

U.S. Highway 10 - Adding One Lane**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$17,600**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$17,600,000 in state funds are requested for a grant to Anoka County for the preliminary engineering, environmental review, final design, right-of-way acquisition, construction and construction administration of a third travel lane in each direction of U.S. Highway 10 from the interchange with Hanson Boulevard to the interchange with Round Lake Boulevard in the city of Coon Rapids.**Project Description**

This project will expand a 3.2 mile section of U.S. Highway 10 from Hanson Blvd to Round Lake Blvd by adding a third travel lane in each direction to improve safety and congestion resulting from U.S. Highway 10 narrowing from six lanes east of Hanson Blvd.

Project Rationale

U.S. Highway 10 is part of a major travel corridor for businesses and commuters between the Twin Cities and St. Cloud. A recent traffic study indicates that during the peak morning and evening rush hours, the highway operates at levels of service (LOS) E or F for portions of the two-lane section of U.S. Highway 10. LOS F is the worst rating a highway can get and is defined as forced or breakdown-flow where every vehicle moves in lockstep with the vehicle in front of it.

Expansion of U.S. Highway 10 from four lanes to six lanes through Coon Rapids will improve mobility through the corridor. Level of service (LOS) with the additional lane never exceeds LOS D, which is the standard for freeway -flow in peak rush hours, and speeds will increase to within 10% of the posted speed limit. Safety will also improve with this expansion with an expected 20% + potential crash reduction.

Project Timeline

Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Review: Sept. 2019 - February 2020

Final Design and Right-of-Way Acquisition: March 2020 - March 2021

Construction and Construction Administration: April 2021 - October 2021

Other Considerations

The section of U.S. Highway 10 in the city of Anoka just west of this project is slated for construction in 2022. That 2-year project will convert U.S. 10 from a 4-lane signalized expressway to a 4-lane freeway. Because the traffic "sheds off" at key interchanges in Coon Rapids this 4-lane facility in Anoka is adequate but the section in Coon Rapids is under-sized. By expanding this section of U.S. 10 prior to the Anoka project, motorists will be able to get to their exit destination (Hanson Blvd, Main St, or Round Lake Blvd) before they hit the construction congestion.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Assuming that highway maintenance costs are \$8,000/lane mile/year, total operating cost increase would be \$8,000 x 3.2 miles x 2 lanes = \$51,200 per year.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This road project will be utilized by commuters, businesses, residents, public safety agencies, transit operators, freight carriers, etc. that all depend on a safe and congestion-free highway system.

Public Purpose

Provide a safe and congestion-free highway infrastructure that meets the demand of the users.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Joe MacPherson
Assistant County Engineer
763-324-3199
joe.macpherson@co.anoka.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

U.S. Highway 10 - Adding One Lane

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$17,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$14,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Trunk Highway 47 Railroad Grade Separation**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$10,000**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** \$10,000,000 in state funds are requested to complete the preliminary engineering, environmental review and remediation, and partial right-of-way acquisition of a railroad grade separation on Trunk Highway 47 at the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad in the city of Anoka.**Project Description**

This project will convert a 2-lane TH 47 with an at-grade railroad crossing to a 4-lane highway with a grade separated overpass at the BNSF Railroad crossing. The project will also realign the highway to remove the "S"-Curves that snake through a metal salvaging yard and the Anoka County Fairgrounds. This realignment will require the acquisition of the metal salvaging property and the remediation of the potentially hazardous soils and groundwater.

Project Rationale

The primary purpose of this project is to improve safety at this existing at-grade crossing and replace it with a 4-lane grade separation. MnDOT's evaluation of this crossing made it the worst rated crossing in the State of Minnesota. In their Risk Factor Based Analysis, MnDOT found eight out of ten risk factors are present at this crossing.

In 2003 there was a horrific crash at this location that claimed the lives of 4 teenagers.

Every year there are multiple crashes occurring within 150 feet of this crossing and BNSF also reports that there are multiple "near misses" at this location every year.

With over 80 trains per day, this crossing causes huge operational issues on TH 47. Over 19,000 vehicles a day travel this section of TH 47. Observed "gate down" times range from less than a minute for Northstar trains to over 4 minutes for freight trains. This causes long backups on TH 47 which can extend to TH 10 which is only 1/3 of a mile south of this location.

This crossing is only 1,500 feet west of the Anoka Northstar Station. False gate down issues have occurred which frustrate drivers and leads them to disobey the gates and drive around them. This "habit" can have serious consequences if people become conditioned to think that the gates are down, but it is ok to drive around them.

Finally, the long queues of traffic on TH 47 block local street intersections and force unnecessary traffic through residential neighborhoods when this traffic should remain on a properly functioning trunk highway.

In December 2016 MnDOT concluded a Feasibility Study for a railroad separation at TH 47 (Ferry Street and concluded:

- The *Texas Priority Index* that was used for this evaluation scored this location as the worst rated railroad crossing in the state.
- The *Risk Based Analysis* used in this evaluation identified 8 out of 10 risk factors to be present at this location.
- The preferred solution is TH 47 going over the BNSF railroad.
- The primary need for this project is to improve safety for motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists and trains. 19,200 vehicles per day use Ferry Street. 40 to 80 trains crossings occur at this location every day. A train crosses Ferry Street every 18 to 36 minutes each day.
- Observed gate down times range from less than one minute to over 4 minutes.
- The crash rate along the TH 47 corridor exceeds the critical crash rate for similar highways.

Project Timeline

Environmental Review: June 2019 to November 2019

Preliminary Engineering: December 2019 to December 2020

Right-of-way Acquisition: October 2020 to March 2021

Other Considerations

The funding request at this time is to progress this project through preliminary engineering, environmental review, site remediation and acquisition of the metal recycling facility/property. Final design, additional right-of-way acquisition, construction and construction administration would come at a later date.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Increased highway maintenance costs estimated at \$50,000 per year.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This road and bridge project will be utilized by commuters, businesses, residents, public safety agencies, transit operators, freight haulers, etc. that all depend on a safe and congestion-free highway system.

Public Purpose

Provide a safe and congestion-free highway infrastructure that meets the demand of the users.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Joe MacPherson

Assistant County Engineer
763-324-3199
joe.macpherson@co.anoka.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$110 million in trunk highway bonds for grants to projects on the Department of Transportation's 2014 Crude by Rail Grade Crossing Study.

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highway 47 Railroad Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$3,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

TH 65 Grade Separation at 109th Avenue**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,500**Priority Ranking:** 3**Project Summary:** \$1,500,000 in state funds are requested to complete the preliminary engineering, environmental documentation and final design of a grade separation and associated improvements to Anoka County State Aid Highway 12 (as known as 109th Avenue) at Trunk Highway 65 in the city of Blaine.**Project Description**

This project will identify a solution to replace the existing at-grade intersection on TH 65 at 109th Avenue with a grade separated solution. This request is for preliminary engineering, environmental documentation and final design only. Funds for right-of-way acquisition and construction will be determined after this study is completed.

Project Rationale

The intersection of TH 65 and 109th Avenue has an entering traffic volume of approximately 65,000 vehicles per day. This amount of traffic is more than the existing at-grade, signalized intersection can accommodate. This leads to crashes and excessive delays to the mainline 65 traffic and especially to the side-street 109th Avenue traffic.

In a recent study conducted by MnDOT and the Metropolitan Council (the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study), this intersection was identified as a "High Priority" intersection that should be evaluated for grade separation.

Besides highway traffic that would benefit from this grade separation, this project would provide a critical linkage for pedestrians and bicyclists to also cross this dangerous intersection.

For a comparison for the amount of traffic that the TH 65 corridor in Blaine must accommodate, the traffic volumes on TH 65 in Blaine are very comparable to the traffic volume on I-35W in Blaine. Could you imagine a traffic signal on Interstate 35W every mile? That is what TH 65 is like every day.

Project Timeline

Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Documentation: May 2020 to May 2021

Final Design: June 2021 to June 2022

Other Considerations

This request is for preliminary engineering, environmental documentation and final design only. Funds for right-of-way acquisition and construction will be determined after this study is completed.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Increased maintenance costs are estimated at \$50,000 per year.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This road and bridge project will be utilized by commuters, businesses, residents, public safety agencies, transit operators, freight haulers, etc. that all depend on a safe and congestion-free highway system.

Public Purpose

Provide a safe and congestion-free highway infrastructure that meets the demands of the users.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Joe MacPherson
Assistant County Engineer
763-324-3199
joe.macpherson@co.anoka.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

TH 65 Grade Separation at 109th Avenue

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Trunk Highway 610 Full-Access Interchange at East River Road**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,500**Priority Ranking:** 4**Project Summary:** \$1,500,000 in state funds are requested to complete the preliminary engineering, environmental documentation, and final design for the completion of a full-access interchange and associated improvements to County State Aid Highway 1 (as known as East River Road) in the city of Coon Rapids.**Project Description**

The existing interchange on TH 610 at East River Road is a "partial" interchange that provides Eastbound TH 610 exits and Westbound TH 610 entrance, but does not provide a Westbound exit or Eastbound entrance to/from East River Road. This project will provide for these two additional movements.

Project Rationale

The completion of TH 610 across the north metro area now extends from U.S. 10 at University Avenue on the Blaine / Coon Rapids border to I-94 in Maple Grove. But it is not yet complete.

There is still a system gap on the west end in Maple Grove, but more importantly to us in Anoka County is the lack of a full access interchange on TH 610 in the city of Coon Rapids.

Both East River Road and Coon Rapids Boulevard have interchanges with TH 610 but both of these are partial interchanges. Eastbound traffic can get off TH 610 and Westbound traffic can get onto TH 610 but the opposite movements do not exist.

This lack of access forces many westbound trips to prematurely get off TH 10 at University Avenue and/or Foley Boulevard, both approximately 1-1/2 miles away, and rumble through county and city roads to get to their real destinations. Because of the heavy commercial uses in this area, many of these trips are heavy trucks which lead to excessive wear and tear on our local system of highways and adds to congestion on these routes as well. This is not right.

After studying several alternatives, we feel that providing a full access at East River Road is the solution.

This location was prohibited in years past because of the proximity of Foley Boulevard with TH 610, the Foley railroad crossing with the BNSF Railway and the Metro Transit Park-n-Ride facility. But Anoka County is currently moving forward with a \$25 million railroad grade separation project slated for construction in 2021 that realigns Foley Boulevard away from TH 610. This realignment now allows for a full access on TH 610 at East River Road.

Project Timeline

Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Documentation: May 2020 to May 2021

Final Design: June 2021 to June 2022

Other Considerations

This request is for preliminary engineering, environmental documentation and final design only. Funds for right-of-way acquisition and construction will be determined after this study is completed.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Increased costs are estimated at \$10,000 per year.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This road and bridge project will be utilized by commuters, businesses, residents, public safety agencies, transit operators, freight haulers, etc. that all depend on a safe and congestion-free highway system.

Public Purpose

Provide a safe and congestion-free highway infrastructure that meets the needs of the users.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Joe MacPherson
Assistant County Engineer
763-324-3199
joe.macpherson@co.anoka.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highway 610 Full-Access Interchange at East River Road

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Red Line 147th Street Station Skyway Project | 1 | GO | 2,625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Red Line 147th Street Station Skyway Project

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,625 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$2.625M in State funds for the Apple Valley Red Line 147th Street Station Skyway Project. State funding is requested to upgrade the existing 147th Street Station in Apple Valley by installing a skyway between the two station buildings along with upgrades to the buildings. |

Project Description

The Apple Valley Red Line 147th Street Station Skyway Project is a modernization improvement project of existing transit facilities in Apple Valley at the 147th Street Station on Cedar Avenue. At the time of construction, the stations (there is a northbound station on the east side of Cedar & a southbound station on the west side) at 147th Street were built to have an indoor waiting area on each side of Cedar Avenue. The existing stations have a finished area of 270 sq. ft. each for a total of 540 sq. ft. The stations were designed so that a future skyway could be installed, connecting the two stations, & providing transit riders & pedestrians a safe way to cross Cedar Avenue without interfering with traffic. The project proposes to not only add the skyway, but to also upgrade the existing station facilities with larger, indoor waiting areas, staircases & elevators as well as ambient lighting to enhance the experience for transit users. The additional area would add 360 sq. ft. to each station for a total additional area of 720 sq. ft. The skyway would provide another 1824 sq. ft. of indoor area. The total additional square footage would therefore be 2544 sq. ft. The proposed total cost of the project would be approximately \$5.25M. Proposed funding would include \$2.625M of State funding (this application) & a matching \$2.625M from the City of Apple Valley & other project partners.

Project Rationale

The shovel ready 147th Street Station Skyway Project will provide a safe crossing for transit users & pedestrians across Cedar Avenue, a six-lane Principal Arterial that grows to nine lanes at the intersection of 147th Street. Because the 147th Street Stations are located midblock, crossing between the stations (an approximate 1250 ft. walk) for return trips is seen as a barrier to the facility. Anecdotally, users of the METRO Red Line have indicated that they prefer to stay on the bus going south to the Apple Valley Transit Station & then ride back north to the 147th Street Station so they can avoid having to cross Cedar Avenue. Building the skyway improvements proposed by this project would increase the safety of transit users, as well as enhance the experience for existing & new users of the METRO Red Line.

Project Timeline

Predesign for the project has largely been completed as the stations are existing & already designed to accept a skyway.

Design/Engineering – November 2021 to March 2022

Bidding – March 2022

Project Award & Construction Start – April 2022

Project Completion – November 2022

Other Considerations

The 147th Street Station serves the METRO Red Line, & is near local bus routes & Minnesota Valley Transit Authority (MVTA) routes. The METRO Red Line is a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line which provides all day service along Cedar Avenue, from the Apple Valley Transit Center to the Mall of America, where it connects to the METRO Blue Line Light Rail Transit (LRT). The METRO Red Line opened in the summer of 2013 & has been a great connector for the people of Dakota County to the greater metropolitan transit system.

Demand at the 147th Street Station is expected to increase by 2040, based on existing land uses, according to the Cedar Avenue Transitway Implementation Plan Update (2015). The connection of the stations via a skyway eliminates potential SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicle) trips & associated vehicle miles travelled (VMT) on congested corridors, including the crossing of the Minnesota River. METRO Red Line users also rely on the BRT service to access employment, shopping, community services, & points on the regional transitway network along the TH 77 corridor without the use of an automobile.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars will be requested in excess of the amount (\$2.625M) requested in this application.

Who will own the facility?

The existing facilities are owned by Metro Transit (Metropolitan Council). They will continue to own the facilities.

Who will operate the facility?

The existing facility is operated & maintained by MVTA (Minnesota Valley Transit Authority) through an agreement with Metro Transit. It can be assumed this arrangement will continue.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility is currently used by METRO Red Line passengers. The METRO Red Line is operated by Metro Transit. This will continue in the future.

Public Purpose

The project will provide a safe & secure facility for riders of the Red Line to use as they travel between the transit stations. The proposed skyway will provide a safe route across Cedar Avenue, a 9-lane Principal Arterial roadway. This safe, sheltered crossing will be especially helpful in inclement weather. Vulnerable populations such as children, the elderly, & the disabled, will have greater access to both stations, with the ability to travel to local destinations on either side of Cedar Avenue without having to go to dangerous street crossings. The skyway & expansion of the facilities will improve customer experience by providing more comfortable waiting areas as well as a more secure facility. Because the skyway connection will allow facility staff & security to access each station in one trip, improved security & maintenance of the stations will be realized by both transit riders & employees alike.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None that the City is aware of.

Project Contact Person

Matt Saam
Public Works Director
952-953-2412
msaam@cityofapplevalley.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Red Line 147th Street Station Skyway Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,625 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$2,225 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,250 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$221 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$409 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,620 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,250 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Arrowhead Regional Corrections

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements | 1 | GO | 3,350 | 0 | 0 | 3,350 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,350 | 0 | 0 | 3,350 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,350 | 0 | 0 | 3,350 | 0 | 0 |

NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$3,350

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Revitalization and enhancement of the buildings that support vocational and educational programming at the Northeast Regional Corrections Center (NERCC). Total cost of the project is \$3.35 million.

Project Description

This project is of regional significance as it encompasses the 5 counties of northeastern Minnesota via the ARC Joint Powers Board. NERCC is a 144 bed correctional facility for adult men owned and operated by Arrowhead Regional Corrections. ARC is a joint powers agency which provides the correctional services to Carlton, Cook, Koochiching, Lake and St Louis counties. NERCC is a unique facility which provides correctional programming, educational/vocational programming as well as work experience related to the operation of a working farm.

The buildings that provide vocational and farm work experiences are in need of upgrades and in some cases expansion. The legislature has provided emergency funding (Chapter 5, Laws of MN, 2015 1st Special Session) to rebuild the Food Processing Facility. In addition, the legislature invested in a study to be completed on developing a butcher training program (Chapter 4, Article 1, Section 2 2015 Laws of MN, 1st Special Session). This request is the next phase of the project and supplemental to the investment already made. The highest priority is expanding the new processing facility and building a packaging facility. This would create an opportunity to provide a butchers training program as well as meet the meat processing needs for area farmers.

Many of the buildings that house NERCC livestock and are necessary to support the farm operations are in need of repairs and updates as well.

In addition, NERCC has a carpenter shop, a welding shop , a mechanics shop, and a school building. Each of these buildings have a variety of capital improvement needs including new roofs and exhaust and makeup air systems.

The preservation and revitalization of the NERCC facility will allow ARC to explore enhancing vocational training programs and complete the capital project first proposed in 2013.

Project Rationale

NERCC has been providing a unique combination of correctional services and work experiences for adult men since the 1930’s with proven results in lowering recidivism rates. The buildings that are used for vocational and educational programming are in need of updating and expansion. This grant would allow ARC to expand the vocational experiences offered to the incarcerated men as well as provide needed services for the region.

Project Timeline

Other Considerations

The five counties of ARC have invested more than \$7 million into an \$11 million project since 2012. To date, the State of Minnesota has contributed \$737,000 in 2012, \$1 million in 2014, \$1.2 million in 2015, and \$600,000 in 2017. By necessity, projects in correctional facilities must be completed in phases. This request allows NERCC to move to the next phase of the project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Arrowhead Regional Corrections.

Who will operate the facility?

Arrowhead Regional Corrections.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

144 bed correctional facility for adult men.

Public Purpose

NERCC provides for the public safety of the Arrowhead region.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The 2012 Capital budget allocated \$737,000 for a new boiler for NERCC.

The 2014 Capital budget allocated \$1,000,000 to design, construct, remodel, furnish, and equip improvements at NERCC campus buildings that support farm operations, educational programming, work readiness, and vocational training.

The 2015 capital budget allocated \$1,200,000 to demolish an existing facility and to design, construct, furnish, and equip a replacement food processing facility on the campus of NERCC.

The 2017 capital budget allocated \$600,000 for the new processing facility.

Project Contact Person

Kay Arola
Executive Director
218-726-2640
arolak@stlouiscountymn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$3.35 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$11,106 | \$3,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | \$7,000 | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$18,106 | \$3,350 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$18,106 | \$3,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$18,106 | \$3,350 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Inflow - Infiltration Assistance Capital Proposal | 1 | GO | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Inflow - Infiltration Assistance Capital Proposal

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$10,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The Association of Metropolitan Municipalities is requesting \$10 million in state bond funding to assist cities in the metropolitan area to correct inflow and infiltration problems in municipal wastewater collection systems.

Project Description

The Association of Metropolitan Municipalities is seeking a \$10 million capital bonding appropriation to assist metro area cities in mitigating inflow and infiltration (I/I) problems in municipal wastewater systems. Inflow and infiltration are terms for the ways that clear water (ground and storm) makes its way into sanitary sewer pipes and is then treated, unnecessarily, at regional wastewater treatment plants. I/I enters the system from a variety of sources including cracks, leaky pipe joints, deteriorated manholes, and through storm water that enters the system through rain leaders, or illegal foundation drains or sump pumps connected to sanitary sewer pipes.

Correcting the problem of excess I/I at the community level helps to alleviate the need for additional regional waster treatment capacity, the cost of which is upward of \$1 billion. These funds would assist in corrections that can help avoid potentially significant public health/safety and environmental consequences associated with this problem, including sanitary sewer overflows. Local communities have undertaken efforts to mitigate I/I at local sources, but corrections continue to need to be made to public systems for this problem to be adequately addressed.

Project Rationale

Many cities in the metropolitan area have been identified by the Met Council as contributing excess levels of clean water (inflow and infiltration) into the regional wastewater system. This clean water, which does not need to be treated, uses capacity in the regional system designed to meet population growth. In 2007, the Metropolitan Council implemented a surcharge program to compel cities to correct I/I related problems in their infrastructure. Cities in the metropolitan area that are contributing excess levels of I/I are surcharged by the Council. The surcharge is waived if they correct these problems.

The problem of excess I/I is regionally significant and can have health and safety and environmental consequences, including sanitary sewer overflows, if not corrected. Sanitary sewer overflows, for example, violate federal clean water standards and offenders are subject to fines.

This funding would assist cities with I/I mitigation. I/I corrections are more cost effective to do locally rather than adding regional wastewater capacity, but the corrections be complex and costly for local governments.

Project Timeline

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The facilities that would be improved through this activity are owned and operated on public rights-of-way by metro area local units of government.

Who will operate the facility?

Metro area local units of government.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Purpose

Description of Previous Appropriations

Previous appropriations include \$3 million in state bonding in 2010, \$4 million in state bonding in 2012, \$2 million in state bonding in 2014, \$3.7 million in bonding funding in 2017. as well as \$1 million in Clean Water funds in 2013, for mitigation on private properties.

Project Contact Person

Patricia Nauman
Executive Director
651-215-4002
patricia@metrocitiesmn.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Inflow - Infiltration Assistance Capital Proposal

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$10,700 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$10,700 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$1,140 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$285 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$9,275 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$10,700 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | No |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | |
| Is the required information included in this request? | |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| East Mesabi Joint Water System | 1 | GO | 6,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

East Mesabi Joint Water System**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$6,100**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** We are requesting \$6,100,000 in state funds for the design and construction of the East Mesabi Joint Water System.**Project Description**

The City of Aurora, in cooperation with the City of Biwabik, City of Hoyt Lakes, and the Town of White, are requesting \$6,100,000 in state funding to acquire land, design and construct a new water treatment plant and distribution system for the communities of Aurora, Hoyt Lakes, Town of White, and Biwabik. The total estimated for the entire project is \$17,200,000.

Currently, these communities each own and operate their own water supply, treatment and distribution system. Each of the systems are facing significant near term and long range challenges. To address these challenges, the potential for a joint water system has been evaluated and it has been determined it provides economies of scale for the member communities and offers more reliability than separate systems.

The City of Biwabik currently uses the Canton Mine Pit as its source for drinking water. Several years ago ArcelorMittal mining company began dewatering at their East Reserve Mine site adjacent to the Canton Pit. The water elevation in the Canton Pit is lowering and will force the City of Biwabik to find a different source for their water supply. The City of Biwabik began to evaluate options for a new water source and began the discussion with neighboring communities to determine if a collaborative joint water system would be more cost effective and efficient than each community continuing with their own systems.

The City of Aurora and the Town of White currently uses the St. James Pit as their source for drinking water. Their existing facility is in need for major improvements in order to continue supplying the needed drinking and fire protection capacities to serve the communities.

The City of Hoyt Lakes currently uses Colby Lake as their source for drinking water. Their existing facility will also require additional improvements and need renovations in the future.

The communities of Aurora, Hoyt Lakes, Town of White, and Biwabik have been meeting since 2011 to discuss various options for a joint water system. The communities, through the East Range Joint Powers Board, have been successful in acquiring funds to start the preliminary planning and design for this new system. This new system would include one central water treatment plant (Located on the Embarrass Pit) with a system of distribution lines that would connect to each of the member communities. Currently each individual community system has been evaluated for water quality, condition of existing facilities, water treatment alternatives and community interconnections.

The project would have two separate phases. The initial phase would include the City of Aurora and the Town of White. A later phase would include the City of Biwabik and/or the City of Hoyt Lakes. Both Biwabik and Hoyt Lakes would like to be in the initial phase of the project, but due to significant financial changes facing both of those communities, they will both have to wait until a later date to join

on to the new system.

The existing independently owned and operated water supplies will be abandoned as drinking water sources. Individual treatment facilities will be decommissioned and either re-purposed or demolished based on communities preference. Distribution systems that are currently in place will be used as part of the new systems infrastructure. Decommissioning and demolition of existing water supply facilities are not included in the request for this project.

Project Rationale

The completion of this project is very important for the communities in that it will allow all entities to meet new water quality standards with smaller financial impact for the residents, improved new water source quality will result in less extensive treatment, it will allow all entities to address existing issues with their water supply, treatment and distribution demands, creates the potential with new economic development (Non-ferrous mining like Polymet, Nugget, Twin Metals and Wood Products/Biomass Expansions), improves and enhances the utilization of existing infrastructure, creates jobs in the short and long term, economies of scale in operating one plant and allows the member communities to work more closely together.

These communities currently work cooperatively on economic development through the East Range Joint Powers Board joint staffing and emergency services (Ambulance/Fire/Police).

Project Timeline

- Engineering Design/Permitting - 09/2019
- Project Bid - 03/2021
- Award Contract - 04/2021
- Begin Construction - 05/2021
- Project Completion - 12/2022

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The city does not intend to seek state grants to support the operation or maintenance of the facility.

Who will own the facility?

Jointly owned by the participating communities

Who will operate the facility?

Jointly operated by the participating communities

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The participating communities

Public Purpose

Municipally-owned cooperative and cost-efficient water system

Description of Previous Appropriations

In fiscal year 2018 the City of Aurora was awarded \$2,500,000 in state bonding bill funds.

Project Contact Person

Becky Lammi
City Clerk/Treasurer
218-229-2614
cityclerk@ci.aurora.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

East Mesabi Joint Water System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,200 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$15,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,200 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | GO | 7,500 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4th Avenue Riverview State Water Trail Enhancement | 2 | GO | 660 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ramsey Scientific and Natural Area Site Improvements | 3 | GO | 4,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 12,560 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 12,560 | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$7,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Austin's wastewater treatment facility has treatment components in use that date back to 1938 and the newest structures were constructed in 2015. In order to accommodate increased flows, community growth and regulations, it has been determined that extensive facility improvements are necessary. It is estimated that these improvements will cost \$73 million.

Project Description**1. Liquid Processing, Alternative #2**

In this alternative, the effluent from the industrial facility would combine with domestic primary effluent in an activated sludge system. Future total nitrogen removal would be addressed with a sequenced plan to either add denitrifying filters or selector zones to the activated sludge system. For Liquid Alternative 2, either biological or chemical phosphorus removal could be considered.

The following improvements are assumed for the Liquid Alternative 2 secondary treatment process:

- Industrial: Replace mechanisms in Separators. The separators do not perform well today. With an additional anaerobic digester, the solids concentration in the digesters can decrease to maintain the solids retention time, which should improve settling. But other separation options could be considered during preliminary design, including anaerobic MBRs or lamella plate settlers. Another reason to consider a different separation technology is because of the proximity of the separator to the flood protection.
- Industrial: Increase the anaerobic pump station wet well volume.
- Industrial: Building addition to accommodate new boiler/heat exchangers.
- Combined: New activated sludge with biological phosphorus removal. System includes recycle and wasting pumps and the required chemical addition back-up system.
- Combined: Final Clarifiers 1 and 2 would be replaced with deeper tanks and new mechanisms. Clarifiers 3 and 4 would have new mechanisms.
- Solids Storage / Processing: A thickening process would be required. There are several options for thickening, including dissolved air flotation thickeners (DAFTs), gravity belt thickeners (GBTs), centrifuge thickeners, and rotary drum thickeners (RDTs). It is recommended that dewatering and cake storage pair with Liquid Alternative 2. Liquid Alternative 2 also requires thickening of the wasted aerobic solids and adding a fourth primary digester.
- Future: Tank baffling for 5-stage Bardenpho modification to Activated Sludge system for total nitrogen treatment and internal recycle pumps.

1.1 Main Pump Station and Preliminary Treatment

The Main Pump Station has undergone recent improvements, including replacement of the influent pumps, new motor control center, and new flow meters. The following improvements are

recommended:

- Replace process valving, including check and gate valves.
- Replace grit removal system, including grit separator, pump, and classifier. Grit system must be sized for the peak flows. Specific options for the grit removal system will be evaluated in preliminary design.
- Install engineered rail system for hoisting pumps and other equipment.
- Replace HVAC system. While some components are 10 years old at this time, they will be due for replacement in 5-10 years.
- Replace the lighting system.
- If the generator is reused, an EPA conversion kit must be added to the exhaust to meet current EPA emissions standards.

1.2 EQ Basin Improvements

As the Excess Flow Tanks are less than 5 years old, the structures are in good condition. Minor structural repairs are recommended for the equalizing tank.

1.3 Primary Settling Tanks

After preliminary treatment, the wastewater flows through aerated grit removal, preaeration, and on to 3 primary settling tanks. This second grit removal system and the preaeration tanks would not be necessary with the recommended Liquid Alternative 2. Without the trickling filters, the return sludge will not have mollusks. The existing three primary clarifiers do not have capacity for average wet weather. The following improvements are recommended:

- Add a 4th primary clarifier, similar to the existing three. In lieu of this, during preliminary design consider retrofitting primary filters within the existing tanks. Primary filters are a developing technology that have gained acceptance in the industry in the past 5 years. Potential benefits of primary filters over primary settling tanks include improved BOD and TSS removal, which can help reduce capital costs associated with the secondary treatment and reduced aeration demand.
- Replace or reconstruct portions of clarifier 1.
- Replace the guardrail and gate structure between clarifiers 1 and 2.
- For clarifiers 2 and 3 it is recommended to reconstruct the scum box and manhole.
- Replace the electrical conduit and conductors. The J-box must be moved outside of the class 1 space. Class 1, Div II space is 18" above the tank and 10' from the edge.

1.4 Disinfection

The facility currently feeds chlorine gas for disinfection and sulfur dioxide for dechlorination. The feed systems are newer. The chlorine contact tank has capacity for the design flows. Due to the safety hazards associated with chlorine gas, many facilities have moved from chlorine gas to ultraviolet (UV) disinfection. A UV disinfection system could be retrofit within the existing chlorine contact tank. The following improvements are recommended for disinfection:

- Consider during preliminary design the costs and non-monetary benefits of moving to a UV disinfection system, compared with the gas disinfection system. Costs presented in this section conservatively assume a UV disinfection system. With the proximity of the disinfection system to a future levee/flood wall, a portion of the costs for structural changes to disinfection could be included in DNR funding.
- Replace the electrical equipment, conduit and starters.
- Upgrade to LED lighting to reduce maintenance and electricity.

- Install new roof over the flood pumps.

1.5 Other Site Improvements

The facility has over 50 buildings or structures which have been constructed between 1938 and 2015. Piping and conduit of varying age and condition connect these buildings and structures. There are a number of miscellaneous improvements needed across the site, these include the following:

Administration Building

- Replace lab exhaust fan, hydronic radiators, and baseboard radiators in the lab area. In the garage area, the furnace, heating, and ventilation should be replaced.
- Install gas detection in the garage storage areas, as this does not meet code.
- Replace HVAC system to provide 6 air changes per hour in the lower level.
- Replace lighting system LED to reduce maintenance and save energy.

Jetter/Landfill Waste Receiving Station

- Install a dump location for jetter trucks. This should consider the grit and FOG in these loads.
- Within this location, or as a separate location, provide for landfill leachate dumping.

Site Piping

- Replace all piping that was installed in the 1930's and 1950's.
- Replace site watermain.
- Work with City staff to determine other piping for replacement.

Site Demolition. With the recommended Liquid Alternative 2, the following process units can be decommissioned or demolished:

- Four high-rate trickling filters
- Two older final clarifiers
- Two intermediate clarifiers
- Nitrifying trickling filters and pumping station
- Intermediate pumping station
- Rotating biological contactors
- Sludge drying beds

1.6 Resource Recovery

Wastewater treatment facilities offer the potential to produce recycled water, generate energy from biogas, and harvest nutrients from the wastewater. These opportunities come with costs. The following sections describe these opportunities.

Project Rationale

At a crossroads where significant investment will be required in the near-term to rehabilitate existing systems, it is prudent to change tracks now to a system that offers more flexibility. Our Facility study recommends a significant change to the facility moving away from a fixed-film treatment system and to an activated sludge system. While trickling filters have worked well for the facility and are considered a low-energy treatment system, trickling filters do not offer flexibility for future nutrient removal requirements. For the industrial facility, anaerobic digestion remains the best option, but the existing system requires additional capacity and other improvements. In addition to the liquid changes, improvements are also necessary to the solids handling systems to alleviate capacity stressors.

Project Timeline

Table 1 – Schedule for Implementation

| Item | Date |
|--|-----------------|
| Submit Facilities Plan | 6/1/2019 |
| Design | 8/2019 – 7/2020 |
| Submit PPL Application and Scoring Worksheet | 3/2020 |
| Request Placement on 2020 IUP | 6/2020 |
| Submit NPDES Permit Modification | 2/2020 |
| Submit Plans and Specification to MPCA | 7/2020 |
| Bidding | 11/2020 |
| Construction | 3/2021 – 7/2023 |

Other Considerations

Funding this project solely through user fees will have a great impact on our community customers. To cover the increased operating costs as well as the debt service, the net revenue from users must increase 62%. Applying this net rate increase and assuming equal cost allocations between industrial and residential, a typical residential monthly bill would increase to \$51.48/month.

The City of Austin is of the opinion that the current WIF and PSIG caps are not appropriate and place communities like Austin at a disadvantage effectively as a result of our population. Formula for these programs should provide an increased share of the total project costs beyond the state maximums and should recognize wastewater treatment costs should be no more than twice the annual costs for those larger population centers which can spread the capital costs over many more users. The reality of the existing programs are insufficient and should better recognize the cost burdens on end users more effectively.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Austin

Who will operate the facility?

City of Austin

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Austin

Public Purpose

Community wastewater treatment

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Craig Clark
City Administrator
507-437-9940

craigc@ci.austin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$7,500 | \$7,500 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$30,875 | \$27,125 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$38,375 | \$34,625 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$7,625 | \$3,875 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$30,750 | \$30,750 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$38,375 | \$34,625 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

4th Avenue Riverview|State Water Trail Enhancement**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$660**Priority Ranking:** 2

Project Summary: Enhance a stretch along the Cedar River State Water Trail within the City of Austin's downtown area that has significant historical value to the city and offers a great connection point for recreational users on the river and the city's paved pedestrian trail. This area is also near the site of the city's planned \$36 million community recreation center that will replace a former downtown power production plant.

Project Description

Create a portage and trailhead at the historic site of Austin's first structure, a former mill on the Cedar River at 4th Avenue NE, part of downtown Austin. This project will provide a scenic gathering and overlook area of the dam. Plans also will include displays showing the community's history and providing information to visitors about the Cedar River State Water Trail and City of Austin's trail system that will connect to regional trails (Shooting Star and Blazing Star). The project will include ADA-compliant canoe/kayak portage above and below the 4th Avenue dam, the rebuilding of walls to enhance flood control, restoration of old mill site making it safe for public use, stream bank restoration, cleanup of downed trees, trailhead and history display, and scenic public gathering area.

Project Rationale

- Attract visitors, generating additional spending and local taxes
- Provide high quality of life to residents, improving employee recruitment and retention for major employers
- Preserve and celebrate local history to enhance quality of life
- Increase adjacent property values
- Support healthy, active lifestyles, saving on health care costs to individuals, employers, insurance providers and government
- Enhance an area already featuring DNR requests – State Water Trail, water access, etc.
- More fully make use of Austin's efforts to improve the Cedar River with over \$9 million in water quality improvement projects planned for 2016-2021
- Make a strong recreation-related connection to Austin's future \$36 million community recreation center to replace old downtown power plant facilities

Project Timeline

- 2020 - Planning, Design and Bidding
- 2021 - Construction

Other Considerations

Enhance an area that the community is investing \$36 million in with the new Community Recreation Center. This trail would be across the river from this site and add to Austin's growing tourism options.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

We are not aware of any. This will be maintained by local general fund appropriation.

Who will own the facility?

City of Austin

Who will operate the facility?

City of Austin

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public use

Public Purpose

Recreational

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Craig Clark
City Administrator
507-437-9940
craigc@ci.austin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

4th Avenue Riverview|State Water Trail Enhancement

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$660 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$660 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$660 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$660 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Ramsey Scientific and Natural Area Site Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$4,400**Priority Ranking:** 3

Project Summary: Create a recreational area near Mower County's largest body of water—Ramsey Mill Pond—part of the Cedar River State Water Trail. Featuring a paved trail connecting Austin trail system to historic, abandoned railroad bridge on one of the state's oldest rail beds; today a DNR Scientific and Natural Area (SNA) trail. Also connects to the Jay C. Hormel Nature Center, where the state's Shooting Star Trail will enter Austin.

Project Description

Local officials - including those with the Cedar River Watershed District; City of Austin; Mower County; and Austin Vision 2020 - have been seeking to acquire about 18.5 acres of flood-prone land, mostly former golf course land along the Ramsey Dam/Ramsey Mill Pond area. This acquisition also would include the west half of an historic, abandoned railroad bridge overlooking Ramsey Mill Pond (note: the bridge's east portion is owned by the DNR and serves as the western end of the state DNR's Wild Indigo Scientific and Natural Area trail). Acquisition involves about 17 acres of former golf course land and another 1.5 acres of private residential property.

Once acquired, local officials would like to restore the historic abandoned railroad bridge and construct a paved pedestrian/bike trail through the acquired property and onto the rail bridge. A paved trail would then continue east one on the Wild Indigo SNA trail. The goal is to connect this area with the City of Austin's extensive pedestrian/bike trail system and the State's Shooting Star Trail that currently ends its western portion at the City's Jay C. Hormel Nature Center. Ramsey Mill Pond would be a significant destination for Shooting Star Trail users.

Other plans with the Ramsey site include a fishing platform at the Ramsey Dam; small amphitheater built into a slope overlooking the dam; and conservation projects on the majority of the 17-acre parcel to restore natural habitat and beautify the area.

Project Rationale

- Attract visitors, generating additional spending and local taxes.
Provide high quality of life to residents, improving employee recruitment and retention for major employers.
- Preserve and celebrate local history to not only enhance quality of life, but also increase adjacent property values.
- Raise adjacent property values, as all public parks and recreation facilities do.
Support healthy, active lifestyles, saving on health-care costs to individuals, employers, insurance providers and government.
- Enhance an area already featuring DNR resources—State Water Trail; SNA; water access, etc.

- More fully make use of Austin’s efforts to improve the Cedar River with over \$9 million in water quality improvement projects planned for 2015-2020.
- Bring more visitors to the Wild Indigo Science and Nature Area; enhance one of the state’s beautiful natural resources.
- Encourage use of the Cedar River State Water Trail.

Project Timeline

Complete to Date - Mower County acquired about 17 acres of former golf course land along the Ramsey Dam/Ramsey Mill Pond area, including the west half of an historic, abandoned railroad bridge overlooking Ramsey Mill Pond (note: the bridge’s east portion is owned by the DNR and serves as the western end of the state DNR’s Wild Indigo Scientific and Natural Area trail). This acquisition involved unused state flood-mitigation funds from DNR along with matching funds from The Hormel Foundation/Austin Vision 2020. This parcel has been annexed into the City of Austin.

Ongoing/Need Funding- Cedar River Watershed District and the City of Austin will continue discussions and planning for the 17-acre parcel. When funding is available and plans are finalized, local officials will create a paved trail along the river through the 17-acre parcel to the abandoned railroad bridge, which will also be refurbished for maintenance and public safety. The trail will then include paving 1 mile of the Wild Indigo SNA to connect with County Road 61 where it will then meander its way back to the City of Austin along the way connecting in with the Todd Park Complex and the J.C. Hormel Nature Center. Also, an additional 1.5-acre residential property is targeted for flood acquisition in this same area.

Other possibilities with the Ramsey site could include a fishing platform at the Ramsey Dam; small amphitheater built into a slope overlooking the dam; and conservation projects on the majority of the 17-acre parcel to restore natural habitat and beautify the area.

This work would be completed from 2020-2022.

Other Considerations

We have had over 1,000 area youth canoe in the a Canoemobile program based at the Ramsey Mill Pond/stretch of the Cedar River State Water Trail.

This provides an essential trail connection to the Hormel Nature Center and new \$7 Million Interpretive Building and connection to the DNR Shooting Star Trail.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

We are not aware of any. This will be maintained by local general fund appropriation.

Who will own the facility?

City of Austin

Who will operate the facility?

City of Austin

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public use

Public Purpose

Recreational

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Craig Clark
City Administrator
507-437-9940
craigc@ci.austin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ramsey Scientific and Natural Area Site Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$2,875 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$575 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | No |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Transportation Improvements | 1 | GO | 1,890 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,890 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,890 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Transportation Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,890

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$1,890,000 is being requested for pre-design, design, and reconstruction of the following streets: 1st Street SE– CSAH 9 east to the City Limits (2,150') Barracuda Ave SE– 1st Street SE to Stratford Street SE (385') Char Avenue SE– 1st Street SE to Stratford Street SE (385') Commercial Alley– 1st Street SE to Stratford Street SE (385') 1st Street SW– Chinook Ave SW to Middle Spunk Lake Boat Landing Estate Drive– CSAH 54 to 400-feet south

Project Description

The project will include the removal and replacement of severely deteriorating streets within the City of Avon. As part of the project, failing pavements and subgrades will be corrected along with the replacement of deteriorating storm sewer and curb & gutter.

The City of Avon has recently had a 0.5% sales tax approved. These funds have been dedicated to future street improvements within the City. They are estimating an annual income from the 0.5% sales tax of \$45,000 to be used towards funding future street projects in the community. These funds would be dedicated to this project.

Project Rationale

Because all of the streets listed above have deteriorated beyond conditions where maintenance is feasible, all segments will require total reconstruction. Reconstruction will consist of removal of all pavement, curb & gutter and storm sewer. Subgrade corrections will be done prior to re-building the new road section. Storm sewer improvements will consist of replacement of the deteriorated storm sewer as well as some new improvements to correct some existing drainage issues in the project area.

Project Timeline

Feasibility Study: Completed
 Final Design: August 2019 – December 2019
 Bidding: January 2020
 Construction: June 2020 – September 2020

Other Considerations

In 2001, the MPCA placed strict requirements on the City of Avon to build a new Class A mechanical wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) at a price tag of \$8 million dollars. Avon's population at that time was just over 1,200. This placed a great financial burden on the residents and businesses in our small town. In order to help pay the incredible price tag of the new WWTF, the city sought to bring in new homes and development into the city. In 2007 the City of Avon was approached by a developer with plans to construct a new development called Avon Estates on the west side of the City.

Since Avon Estates and the new WWTF were constructed, there has been a significant economic recession which has affected the City of Avon and much as the rest of the nation. The original developer of Avon Estates has since folded, leaving the City of Avon to develop the remaining phases.

In addition to the developer walking away from Avon Estates, the City is still experiencing vast economic hardships resulting from the original construction of the WWTF. Currently, the WWTF is only operating at 25% of its capacity because Avon Estates has not developed as anticipated and the City has received little help from the DNR or MPCA in requiring township lakeshore properties to come onto city services. The City is therefore not collecting the income from taxes or user fees as expected. This combination is requiring the city to re-pay the bond from the WWTF construction with general funds and not allowing the city to fund construction of our growing number of failing streets.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project would not require any additional funds beyond the project year.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Avon will own the facilities.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Avon will operate the facilities.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facilities would be used by a number of different users. 1st Street specifically would serve City residents as well as a number of businesses that reside on the east side of the City. There is a high amount of truck traffic that uses this route to access I-94 from businesses on the east end of 1st Street. The Middle Spunk Lake access is a heavily used regional lake access used by any number of people in the region.

Public Purpose

It is a municipalities duty to provide roadways that provide for the safe and efficient transport of people, goods, and services, as well as offer safety to pedestrians. The City of Avon, having been faced with stringent requirements to provide also for the safe and effective treatment of wastewater, has simply been tapped out and is requesting the assistance of our partners at State of Minnesota to ensure that our roadways can be maintained for the good of the public of the City of Avon as well as regional roadway system users that travel to and through our community which is located along Interstate 94 just minutes from St. Cloud.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Jodi Austing-Traut
City Administrator
320-356-7922
jodi.a@cityofavonmn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Transportation Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,890 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$45 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,935 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,935 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,935 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Wastewater Treatment Facility | 1 | GO | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Wastewater Treatment Facility

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$5,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$5.5 million in state funds is requested to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new building for the Babbitt Public Utilities Wastewater Treatment Facility.

Project Description

This project consists of upgrading the existing wastewater treatment facility in Babbitt. The components of the existing facility are over 50 years old and have reached the end of their useful life and it's not economically viable to repair many of the components. The City is required to meet new MPCA requirements, one of which is the new mercury limits. The City of Babbitt is working closely with MPCA and PFA to fund the project and to meet all necessary requirements.

Project Rationale

The City of Babbitt's wastewater treatment facility is faced with new, stringent mercury limits. The existing facility, parts of which are 68 years old, cannot meet these new limits. The project which the City is requesting funding will improve the existing wastewater treatment facility to meet the new mercury limits and replace existing aged infrastructure, positioning the City to better address other future limits.

Project Timeline

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Permit Reissuance | Summer 2019 |
| Design – submit plans & specs to MPCA | March 2020 |
| MPCA certify project | June 2020 |
| Secure PFA Funding | Aug/Sept 2020 or 2021 |
| Award Project | January 2022 |
| Start Construction | Spring 2022 |
| Construction Progress Update | Summer 2023 |
| Complete Construction | Fall 2024 |
| Permit Compliance | Fall 2024 |

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City of Babbitt and the PUC will be responsible for annual operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

City of Babbitt

Who will operate the facility?

Babbitt Public Utilities

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Businesses and residents of the City of Babbitt

Public Purpose

To provide municipal wastewater treatment facilities

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Cathy Bissonette
Clerk-Treasurer
218-827-3647
cathy@babbitt-mn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Wastewater Treatment Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Museum Becker County | 1 | GO | 3,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Museum Becker County**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$3,250**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$3.25 million in State funds is requested to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new County Museum facility.**Project Description**

This project will replace the current Becker County Museum located in an old church structure with a new building attached to the Detroit Lakes Community Center and Holmes Theater. The new building will be handicap accessible, provide exhibits and classroom space and enhance the museum's ability to tell the history of Detroit Lakes and the surrounding communities to future generations. 21st Century programming and hands on learning opportunities will provide all ages and abilities the opportunity to learn the connection between science, technology and local history.

Project Rationale

This project will provide a new building that will house the Becker County Museum's collection of artifacts and historic items related to Becker County and the region. The new structure will be attached to the Detroit Lakes Community Center and the Historic Holmes Theatre building located at 806 Summit Ave, Detroit Lakes, MN. The Museum is currently housed adjacent to the Community center.

The propose Becker County Historical Society and Museum project is two stories plus a basement space for some mechanical and storage. The building will be constructed with masonry, and steel. The spaces will have sufficient height to allow for larger exhibits. The spaces will be open and flexible for a variety of traveling museum exhibits for children. The Heating and Air Conditioning system will be supplied by the Detroit Lakes Community and Center which has replaced their HVAC system. This shared use will provide a state of the art energy efficient system better suited for the environment of museum/archival items.

The current structure of the Becker County Historical Society and Museum building was constructed in 1948 for a church. The building was destroyed by fire in 1956 and rebuilt in 1957. The museum acquired the property in 1989 after outgrowing their space in the basement of the courthouse and another location they were pursuing burned to the ground. At the time it was an increase in square footage for the museum and the building was a safer environment. Several additions/modifications have occurred within the building's history. Due to the layout of the building and its prior use, there are many areas that are not usable space due to layout and access. The building has little historic merit and would not be considered for the National Historic Register status.

Most importantly, a new facility would give our artifacts and documents safe housing. The building is in dire need of replacement. The roof that has been deemed unsafe and not able to be repaired by local roofing contractors and ongoing water issues exist from both the roof and exterior walls. The Research Library has been affected by heavy roof damage resulting in lost books and original

documents due to mold. The NE corner of the building is experiencing crumbling bricks on the exterior as well as a foundation shift resulting in windows that have fallen out. We have had weeks where the water is coming in from the roof and seeping in through basement walls and floor at the same time. The costs to fix the facility are more costly than to simply replace the building.

Additionally, the facility has limited handicap access. Our small elevator is unreliable and has stopped between floors at times. The parts required to address this are no longer being made. Bathrooms are not handicap accessible with narrow doorways in concrete walls and small spaces. The bathrooms only have pipes for cold water making them unsanitary, lack of air circulation and a modern sprinkler system.

Considerable staff hours and resources are spent keeping what we have safe, requiring staff to shift artifacts from location to location depending on the time of year and weather challenges.

Due to the lack of usable onsite space continuing to become unusable, artifacts are also stored in an adjacent house and an offsite storage facility. Having artifacts scattered in three locations and the need to haul fragile items between facilities results in many of our artifacts simply not being put on display to the public. A new facility would allow all artifacts to be store in one safe location and the ability for a rotation schedule of all artifacts to be developed for public viewing.

Many exhibit areas are poorly lit in the current facility and the current fluorescent lighting is harmful to artifacts and shortens their physical lifespan. Visitors experience areas of poorly lit exhibit spaces due to inadequate lighting. Planned use of energy efficient LED timed lighting not only saves on energy consumption but also provides the safest lighting to illuminate our collection. Modern up-to-date heating and cooling systems will increase energy efficiency and provide an optimum museum environment and visitor experience.

A hands on Science center will allow the Becker County to continue to grow our children's programming. 21st Century learning through robotics camp, learning to code a 3d printer, and camps focused on our Natural Resources in our region give those of all ages the ability to learn how Science impacts tomorrow's history.

The new museum will have the capabilities to record oral histories from area residents. Imagine doing research on a topic such as ice harvesting and listening to a Becker County resident talk about working the ice harvest. The temperatures they endured and the challenges and fun the close knit crews would have. The learning opportunities are endless and will carry our region well into the future.

Whether a parent or grandparent entertaining a young child, or school groups performing science experiments, or a school-aged student doing research, or an adult sitting listening to grandparents that have left us but their voices are forever recorded in our oral history section, the museum will bring an immeasurable impact to NW Minnesota.

Project Timeline

March 2018 - Continuous: Funding / Fund Raising
March 2019 - May 2020: Design Phase
June 2020: Bidding & Negotiations
July 2020 - August 2021: Construction
September 2021: Occupancy

Other Considerations

Becker County, Detroit Lakes, Audubon, Frazee, Lake, Ogema and 50% of all Becker County Township have recognized through financial pledges, the dire situation of the building that currently houses the Becker County Historical Society and Museum and supports this project and has pledged dollars to the project. Both the City of Detroit Lakes and Becker County are in support of the DLCCC and the Becker County Historical Society and Museum attaching to better serve the region.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars are anticipated for this project

Who will own the facility?

Becker County

Who will operate the facility?

The Becker County Historical Society and Museum

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Becker County Historical Society and Museum

Public Purpose

A new Becker County Historical Society and Museum facility will provide learning opportunities to not only Becker County but to the entire region. A new facility will become a gathering place or learning for all despite age or ability.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None received previously - No previous or pending obligations

Project Contact Person

Becky Mitchell
Executive Director
218-847-2938
becky@beckercountyhistory.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Museum Becker County

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$532 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$14 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$734 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$620 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$12 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$375 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$40 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,588 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$65 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$370 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Becker Business Park Expansion | 1 | GO | 24,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 24,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 24,760 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Becker Business Park Expansion

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$24,760**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The City of Becker is planning for the installation of new trunk sanitary sewer, trunk water main and water supply improvements associated with industrial growth opportunities in the Becker Business Park. With the announcement of the decommissioning of the Sherco Power Plant located in Becker, the infrastructure build out will provide necessary infrastructure for business growth in the Business Park to replace the lost property tax revenue.

Project Description

The first phase of the trunk utility infrastructure project to serve approximately 450 acres of undeveloped property would include the construction of three major components: additional wells for added water capacity, trunk water main, and trunk sanitary sewer. The total infrastructure project is estimated at \$22 Million. The property within the City's planned extended Business Park is not presently served by municipal water or sanitary sewer. The existing municipal sanitary sewer infrastructure serving the current Business Park has limited capacity available, which currently hinders growth opportunities.

The initial business park expansion is estimated to have a water demand of an additional one million gallons per day. To meet the need, multiple new wells will need to be established and connected to the City's current water distribution infrastructure. This portion of the project is approximately \$2.9 Million.

The proposed trunk water main improvements for the initial Business Park expansion consists of a combination of 12-inch and 16-inch trunk water mains that would connect to the City's existing water main lines at Industrial Boulevard and Liberty Lane. The water main layout provides for "looping" of the water main system and provides greater system reliability to the industrial customers. This portion of the project is approximately \$4.4 Million.

The first phase of sewer infrastructure will support development near the Sherco Power Plant. The new infrastructure consists of the development of three new pump stations, sewage force mains, and trunk gravity sewers. This portion of the project is estimated at \$14.7 Million.

Project Rationale

A nationwide transition from a coal-based energy economy to one based on renewable energy sources will have a significant negative impact on the City of Becker's tax base. The Sherburne County Generating Station (Sherco), the largest electric power plant in Minnesota, accounts for 75 percent of Becker's tax base. The City of Becker and Sherburne County have been working to offset the financial loss from the retirement of three coal units at Sherco. Our strategy is to diversify and expand our business base and replace the jobs that will be lost through the decommissioning process.

A proposal to build a \$600 million data center on Sherco land would be a catalyst for new investment in the region that will attract professional wage, new-economy jobs and long-term economic vitality and will further strengthen the region's fiber optic network. The public infrastructure improvements at the Becker Business Park are needed to attract additional businesses and entrepreneurs.

Project Timeline

The City anticipates the design process to prepare construction documents will occur between August 2020 and February 2021. The City would solicit public bids for the construction contract in late March 2021. Construction of the proposed utility infrastructure improvements is anticipated to span approximately two construction seasons. Following award of a construction contract in April 2021, construction is anticipated between May and mid-November of 2021, and between April 2022 and October 2022.

Funding award notice from State: June 1, 2020
City orders in project design: July 2020
Project Design: August 2020 - February 2021
Bidding: March 2021
Construction Contract Award: April 2021
Construction: May 2021 - October 2022
Construction mid point: October 2021
End construction: October 2022

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The infrastructure project, if the bonding request is approved, will not directly relate to any other State operating subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

The project is water and sewer infrastructure that will be owned by the City of Becker.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Becker will operate the infrastructure.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The infrastructure will be owned and operated by the City of Becker and will serve multiple businesses and properties within the Becker Business Park.

Public Purpose

The water and sewer infrastructure expansion will allow the City of Becker to expand the City's capacity to serve new businesses in the expanded Becker Business Park. This will allow the City to further job growth and economic diversification efforts.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not applicable. No appropriations prior to this request.

Project Contact Person

Marie Pflipsen
Community Development Director
763-200-4246
mpflipsen@ci.becker.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Becker Business Park Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$24,760 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$24,760 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,193 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$1,016 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$18,776 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,775 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$24,760 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Water Treatment Plant | 1 | GO | 8,188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 8,188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 8,188 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Water Treatment Plant**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$8,188**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$8.188 million in state funds is requested to predesign, design, equip and integrate a Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) water treatment plant in the City of Bemidji.**Project Description**

The project is for the installation of a Greensand Filtration System waterplant requiring a 2500 gallon-per-minute Granular Activated Carbon (GAC) Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Water Treatment system. This water plant is required to treat groundwater contaminated by PFAS chemicals. The PFAS water plant will be located on City property.

Project Rationale

Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) have been detected in all five of the City of Bemidji's municipal water supply wells. PFAS are chemicals associated with the manufacturing of products such as Teflon and are also found in firefighting foam known as aqueous film-forming (AFFF). Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) guidance related to how much PFAS is safe for consumption has changed, in 2017 and 2018 guidance was released resulting in lower levels. The cumulative effect of multiple PFAS compounds is captured in the calculation of a term called the Health Risk Index (HRI). The City is required to treat its municipal water for PFAS to meet new MDH HRI and federal rules and guidelines to ensure public drinking water is safe and free from PFAS chemical contamination.

Project Timeline

The project would start design in June 2020. The project would be bid in June 2021 with construction completed by the end of June 2023

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Bemidji

Who will operate the facility?

City of Bemidji

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Bemidji

Public Purpose

Public water supply pollution remediation

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Nate Mathews
City Manager
210-759-3565
nate.mathews@ci.bemidji.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Perfluoroalkyl Substance (PFAS) Water Treatment Plant

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$8,188 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$8,188 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,376 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,363 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$11,637 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,376 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,376 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Lift Station Bypass | 1 | GF | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Lift Station Bypass

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$421

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Birchwood Village (Washington County) requests \$421,000 in state funds to cover the costs (design, engineering and road reconstruction) for taking a failing lift station off line by building a gravity sewer pipe bypass into White Bear Township (Ramsey County).

Project Description

An emergency arose this past year when an existing Birchwood lift station had one pump fail creating 100% reliance on the back up pump for all sewage disposal. We were told that due to the age of the lift station (built ca 1962 and rebuilt ca 1999) a replacement pump system was no longer available and a retrofit would not be guaranteed. Moreover, the design was functionally obsolete (according to OSHA standards) and the lift station was rotting from the inside out. This created an imminent environmental risk to White Bear Lake due to its proximity 150 feet away and directly downhill from the site.

The project has involved the construction of 400 feet gravity sewer pipe from the City of Birchwood to an existing White Bear Township sewer pipe that ultimately flows to a township lift station. This design is a creative cross-government solution that has allowed Birchwood to remove a lift station and tie into an existing system in place nearby.

The project involved significant design and engineering costs (\$67,000). Various governmental agencies were involved in permitting and oversight: Washington County (road), Ramsey County (road), White Bear Township (sewer coordination and logistics), Met Council and Rice Creek Watershed (permits). A cheaper solution was originally sought for a direct-connect across private property, but negotiations were unsuccessful. The construction bid was \$354,000 for a total of \$421,000. Costs were also higher due to the extreme depth (approximately 30 feet below grade) of the inlet pipe and the lack of sufficient ROW requiring removal of all bituminous of the roadway.

Construction was started in early November 2019 and final road reconstruction will not happen until spring of 2020.

Costs have been borne exclusively by the City of Birchwood and it has completely depleted all our "Rainy Day" funds.

Project Rationale

A replace of the current infrastructure would have exceeded \$500,000. This project has imposed an extreme hardship on our community of 875 residents. The project costs exceed our annual levy by 115%. Our annual levy of 380 homes is \$364,000. We have no commercial tax revenue. As a result of spending down all our accounts, we have no remaining funds for any other unforeseen expenses. Moreover, we have increased our 2020 levy by 30% to recover some of these expenses. That extraordinary increase will have to remain in place for at least four years to reestablish our operating

reserves. We have no access to other funding opportunities.

We believe we have done as much as we could in a responsible manner to resolve a problem that could have had a huge negative impact on the area and its prized resource of White Bear Lake. We have been successful in that regard, but at an extreme cost for a city our size.

Project Timeline

Due to the risk to the lake, time was of the essence. Planning for the project began in January of 2019 seeking alternative solutions. Solutions via a direct connect over private property were sought but abandoned in May. An alternative, last resort ROW plan was then drafted. Numerous government approvals were coordinated over the course of the summer. The bid was awarded in September after publication requirements were met. Nonetheless, construction was delayed due to the need for substantial dewatering and then the extreme heavy rains throughout the month of October. Actual connection of the pipes was a week ago. Final paving and removal of the old lift station will occur next spring.

Other Considerations

The project is an example of neighboring community governments coming together to solve a problem that had not been considered before. We are very proud to have the support of those agencies resulting in a positive outcome for our city and our region.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of Birchwood Village is responsible for the maintenance and repair of the pipe and manholes (3). The good news is the expected lifetime is now 100 years with no risk of pump failure as gravity is working 24/7 in our favor.

Who will operate the facility?

The city contracts with White Bear Township already for sewer maintenance services of its other lift stations so the transition is seamless.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The City of Birchwood Village

Public Purpose

Incorporating a gravity bypass pipe in lieu of a lift station pumping system greatly increases the safety of sewage disposal the region and efficiently uses existing infrastructure with no additional public cost.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Mary Wingfield
Mayor
wingfield.mary@gmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Lift Station Bypass

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$421 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$421 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$67 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$354 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$421 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Greater Twin Cities Public Safety Training Area | 1 | GO | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 950 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Greater Twin Cities Public Safety Training Area

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$950**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: In 2013, a collaborative effort began with a need to create a training area in Anoka County for Public Safety agencies. This training area would serve Law Enforcement, Fire and Public Works agencies in Anoka County as well as additionally serving agencies from the north metro and the region as a whole. A modern training area will provide not only a secure, consistent and safe area for agencies to train, but, also a training area which included advanced training props and facilities.

Project Description

With the recent demolition of the Fridley Fire Training Area (2017) and the limited local training opportunities which do not benefit all Anoka County Public Safety partners. For Fire agencies, the nearest fixed training facility with live fire training capability is Minneapolis's Emergency Operations Training Center. Our law enforcement partners have a mix of private/public facilities across the North Metro and the nearest multi-discipline training area is the South Metro Public Safety Training Center in Edina.

The entire scope of the project is yet to be developed including design, cost, governance structure and exact location. Examining the process of the HERO Center development in Cottage Grove, provides a guideline as to what to expect. Public safety agencies in the north metro continue to suffer from training issues identified in the 2009 Minnesota DPS, Public Safety Training Facility Needs Assessment. Some of those issues are long travel distances to facilities, firing ranges already operating at capacity, lack of safe/secure training environment and cost. Of the agencies surveyed in Anoka County, none were willing to travel over 20 miles for training and only five would be willing to travel more than 16 miles.

In April 2018, a stakeholder survey was conducted with Anoka County Public Safety Agencies and to ascertain support for and general training features of a training area. Such a project was overwhelmingly supported by all disciplines with 21 law enforcement, fire and public works agencies supporting the concept. We recognize the need for a multi-discipline training facility serving Anoka County, the North Metro and the Region, effectively serving the ever increasing training requirements.

Phase 1 of the project is requesting funding for a predesign and design process to determine the scope of the entire project. We expect that a complete facility will have state of the art law enforcement and fire training simulators, props, ranges and needed building infrastructure.

Project Rationale

This request for pre-design/design funding will provide the needed capital to start the project, engage multiple stakeholders in a more comprehensive needs assessment, develop a business plan and many other essential planning items critical to the success of the project. The Greater Twin Cities Regional Public Safety Training Area concept follows the DPS's recommendations by improving

existing facilities, multi-discipline training opportunities, provide for collaboration with higher education institutions, provide for regional agency training opportunities and collaborative training with local mutual aid response partners.

Project Timeline

1. Request funding from State Legislature for Pre-Design/Design process - 2019/2020
2. Pre-Design/Design Process - 2020/2021
3. Request 50% funding for construction from State Legislature - 2021/2022
4. Construction - 2023/2024

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None at this time.

Who will own the facility?

Ownership methodology will follow the model established by the HEROs project located in Cottage Grove, MN. Owners will provide Capital funding for the project. Currently the cities of Blaine, Coon Rapids and Andover have shown interest.

Who will operate the facility?

The facility will operate through guidelines contained within a JPA executed between the owners of the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Users will consist of (but not limited to) Local, State and Regional Public Safety and Public Works agencies as well as private organizations.

Public Purpose

The public purpose is to provide a state of the art training facility for all public safety disciplines as well as public works and private organizations. This facility will fulfill a significant need and will result in greater efficiency and effectiveness in areas of emergency response and management.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None for this project

Project Contact Person

Charles Smith
Fire Chief
763-786-4436
csmith@sbfmfire.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

(\$ in thousands)

Greater Twin Cities Public Safety Training Area

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,900 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,900 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Center for the Arts Expansion | 1 | GO | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |

Center for the Arts Expansion

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$10,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** A 22,000 square foot addition to the existing Center for the Arts which will include a 300-500 seat concert hall to accommodate large bands, orchestras, choirs and other music groups as well as rehearsal space, on-site café, support spaces and an enhanced entryway with improved accessibility.**Project Description**

The 32,000 square foot Center for the Arts, adjacent to Bloomington Civic Plaza, provides performing, visual arts programming and lifelong arts learning opportunities that engage the region's most talented artists, student performers and everyone in between. The current facility includes the 366-seat Schneider Theater, 120-seat Black Box Theater, two art galleries, six classrooms/art studios, a dance studio and rehearsal room. The demands for producing increasingly high caliber musicals, theater performances and music concerts at the Center for the Arts necessitates a 22,000 square foot addition anchored by a new concert that will address the specialized needs of musical performances. The concert hall will be acoustically appropriate and be able to seat a full orchestra. At the same time, the Schneider Theater will be renovated to specialize in theatrical use.

Project Rationale

The Center for the arts opened in 2003 as a venue to accommodate a modest theater program, a ballet company, community band concerts and several choirs. In the intervening 16 years the programs have flourished and the facility is bursting at the seams.

The facility is home to seven non-profit arts organizations and hosts activities by many others.

An expansion of the Center would leverage the facility's resounding success as a regional destination for artists and audiences. It will also foster greater engagement in the arts in a prime and increasingly diverse south suburban setting.

Project Timeline

A needs analysis and facilitated stake holder meetings have been taking place for nearly two years. Concept plans have been developed.

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Bloomington

Who will operate the facility?

City of Bloomington

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Artistry, Bloomington Symphony Orchestra, Medalist Concert Band, Angelica Cantani, Continental Ballet Company, Bloomington Chorale, NOTE-able Singers and Alive & Kickin:, Chameleon Theatre Circle

Public Purpose

Sixteen years after it opened, the Center for the Arts is bursting at the seams. An expansion of the center would leverage the facility's resounding success as a regional destination for artists and audiences. It would also foster greater engagement in the arts in a prime and increasingly diverse south suburban setting.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City of Bloomington has not received previous State funding for the Center for the Arts.

Project Contact Person

Jim Urie
Center for the Arts Manager
952-215-9765
jurie@BloomingtonMN.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$10 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Center for the Arts Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$10,355 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$21,355 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$18,700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,655 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$21,355 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Infrastructure Capital Improvements | 1 | GO | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 600 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Infrastructure Capital Improvements

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$600 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$600,000 of state funds is requested to design and construct public infrastructure improvements to the water and wastewater collection system in the City of Bovey. |

Project Description

The City of Bovey has identified various Capital Improvements to the City's infrastructure. This Capital Improvement Plan incorporates drinking water supply and sanitary sewer collection system improvements of old deteriorated utility pipes.

Project identification was developed in conjunction with various meetings with the City Council and City Staff. The City has been diligent in identifying and replacing infrastructure over the past 15 years and needs to continue making improvements to the infrastructure. Funding has become difficult, the City has incurred debt to make past improvements. The City does budget for making continued improvements, however cannot afford to make \$1.1 million of improvements with all City funding, unless large user fees, rate increases or a large increase in the levy was implemented.

Project areas currently identified as a priority include Seventh and Eight Avenues, and installation of water meters to meter water of the users of the system.

Project Rationale

Capital Improvements Projects were identified and reviewed. Each project was provided with a scope, preliminary opinion of probable construction cost and a proposed timetable for making the improvement. Each project identified is feasible and is necessary to provide the City of Bovey with the necessary infrastructure to effectively provide its residents with an acceptable system. A Summary of Projects, the preliminary cost and a proposed time frame for making the improvements follows.

Completion of the utility replacement projects will reduce future operation and maintenance costs resulting from emergency repairs to the utilities. Many of the utility projects identified are necessary due to past water main breaks or collapsed sanitary sewer lines that have necessitated emergency spot repairs. The utility projects identified include utilities that are beyond the design life of the utilities. It is recommended to replace the utility that have exceeded their design life. Water meter installation will provide a useful tool for billing based on useage and can assist with identifying water loss.

The City has been diligent in identifying and replacing infrastructure over the past 15 years and needs to continue making improvements to the infrastructure. Funding has become difficult, the City has incurred debt to make past improvements. The City does budget for making continued improvements, however cannot afford to make \$1.1 million of improvements with all City funding, unless large user fees, rate increases or a large increase in the levy was implemented.

Based upon the plan, it can be concluded that:

- Improvements to the various components of the City of Bovey's infrastructure are necessary to provide reliable, cost-effective and up-to-date infrastructure and facilities for its residents and visitors.
- Continued infrastructure improvements including replacement of water mains and sanitary sewers and street improvements are recommended. These improvements will benefit the entire City through reduced emergency repair costs, reduced sewer backups, reduced extraneous water entering the sanitary sewers and reduced future maintenance costs associated with the older components of the infrastructure. The street and utility projects are shovel ready projects.

Project Timeline

Project Schedule

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Planning | March 2019-December 2019 |
| Secure Funding/Financing | May 2020 |
| Bid and Award Construction Contract | August 2020 |
| Begin Construction | August 2020 |
| Complete Construction | October 2021 |

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Bovey will own the facility

Who will operate the facility?

City of Bovey will operate the facility

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Bovey will use the facility

Public Purpose

Public water infrastructure improvements.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous appropriations have been encumbered.

Project Contact Person

Tara DeGuisseppi
Clerk
218-245-1633
boveycity@hotmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Infrastructure Capital Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$8 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$95 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$922 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead | 1 | GO | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$4,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Four million dollars in state funds is requested to design, engineer and construct the Riverfront Trail and Trailhead park and parking lot located between College Drive and Washington Street and along East River Road in Brainerd.

Project Description

The vision driving the Brainerd Riverfront Project is to maximize our Mississippi Riverfront in a way that will create recreational, economic and cultural opportunities for the Brainerd Lakes Area’s residents and visitors.

The geography and location of the Mississippi River is an integral part of Brainerd’s history, providing economic and cultural benefits for the community. The town thrived for years as a railroad town, then a paper mill town and now a center of regional commerce. The Mississippi Riverfront Project is seeking to invigorate the community by engaging resources to restore the Riverfront as an essential element of our community’s health.

Beginning in 2014, the Riverfront Committee formed to leverage the resource of the third largest river in the world to spark an economic revival and create a community poised to attract and retain future generations of workers and residents. If successful, Brainerd would join cities such as St. Cloud, Duluth, and the Cuyuna Range area who are turning to their natural resources to spur economic growth and position themselves for brighter futures.

In 2015 the Mississippi River Partnership Plan identified many opportunities to connect Brainerd’s neighborhoods and the downtown business community to the river using trails, parks, and other amenities. Currently, key projects have been identified and funding sources sought to bring these plans to reality.

Success hinges on building connections within Brainerd to its five miles of riverfront and to capitalize on the town’s position as a regional trail hub connecting multiple trails including the Paul Bunyan Trail, the Cuyuna Lakes Trail, the Cuyuna Recreation Area to the northeast and the Crow Wing State Park Trail to the south. This trail will also connect to the City’s Buffalo Hills Trail, Northland Arboretum, Rotary Riverside Park, Kiwanis Park, and the business districts for both Brainerd and Baxter.

The proposed Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead is a key element to create this connection. This riverside facility will tie regional trails together - providing a trailhead and parking for the Cuyuna Lakes Trail and Paul Bunyan Trail - offer scenic access to the water, provide local schools with an outdoor classroom and give residents and visitors a place to gather thus maximizing our Mississippi Riverfront in a way that will create recreational, economic and cultural opportunities for Brainerd and the entire region.

Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead in Downtown Brainerd will act as a trailhead for regional bike trails and as a community gathering place. This space will offer trailhead users river access, green space, an outdoor classroom for area high school and college students, and an amphitheater for music and theater performances.

Bringing this vision to life will expand economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities for Brainerd Lakes Area residents and the thousands of tourists who visit the region every year.

Imagine expanded local bike trails that all lead to one dynamic, community location in Downtown Brainerd, where nearby restaurants and shops provide food and entertainment, where families gather on a sunny afternoon to enjoy one of the area's grandest natural resources.

Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead Amenities:

- River access
- Canoe/kayak landing
- Green space for families and pets
- Gathering spaces
- Varied seating options
- Outdoor amphitheater
- Outdoor learning center
- Trailhead for regional bike trails
- Bike repair station
- Public art
- River views
- Storm water management

Project Rationale

Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead will act as a trailhead for regional bike trails and as a community gathering place. This space will offer trailhead users river access, green space, an outdoor classroom for area high school and college students, and an amphitheater for music and theater performances.

This trail will also connect downtown to the rest of the trails winding through the City, including the Cuyuna, Paul Bunyan, Northland Arboretum, Kiwanis and Rotary Riverside Park.

Bringing this vision to life will expand economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities for Brainerd Lakes Area residents and the thousands of tourists who visit the region every year.

Project Timeline

- Feasibility Study: June - October 2019
- Pre-design: November 2019 - April 2020
- Survey and Design: May - September 2020
- Final Design and Plans: October 2020 - April 2021
- Construction: May - September 2021

The Riverfront Committee has been working on the concept for the trail and trailhead since 2014.

Presentations have been given to the Senate Finance Committee, Mississippi Parkways Commission, Area legislators, City Council, that National Park Service and multiple local service organizations.

Other Considerations

This new riverfront trail and trail head is envisioned as a place that connects Brainerd to the Mississippi River. Drawing residents and visitors alike, the trail and trail head will serve as a destination and entry point to the Mississippi River. People will come to the riverfront trail head to connect: to neighbors, to the river, to future and present trails, to new friends and new ways of seeing Brainerd and the Mississippi. Visitors can gather at the trail head park and amphitheater, which includes a circle of reinforced turf designed to support crowds and vehicles, and is surrounded by a variety of seating options.

Visitors can also get closer to the river from a series of steps that work their way toward the waters' edge. The trail head space also takes advantage of the adjacent hillside, providing a natural amphitheater, at the top of which are stunning views of the river and cityscape. Sustainable features include a filtration garden that cleans stormwater from roads and parking lots before it enters the river, permeable paving, and iconic, high efficiency lighting.

Additionally, the City has received a technical services grant to work with the National Park Service to design the trail head facility. This project is currently underway and will conclude by the end of 2019.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City of Brainerd will not be seeking any additional state operating dollars for the ongoing maintenance of this trail or trail head once it is built. Our city has a robust parks and streets department that is adequately staffed to maintain our trails and parks network.

Who will own the facility?

City of Brainerd

Who will operate the facility?

City of Brainerd

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Brainerd Lakes Area residents, Central Lakes College Students, ISD 181 Students, Lakes Area Music Festival and the thousands of tourists who visit the region every year.

Public Purpose

Connect downtown to the rest of the regional trails, which will assist in Brainerd's 'brand' by ultimately connecting the City to the River. To provide passive and active recreational opportunities to the public that will be ADA accessible. Connect multiple state trails as well as city parks and the business districts of both Brainerd and Baxter. Improved health and wellness in the community. As witnessed with Cuyuna State Recreation Area, trails add a new level of economic vibrancy to a community and foster additional economic development which will assist our tax base. Additionally, this trail segment is located within the economic hub of the region - Brainerd/Baxter and near all hotels and trails. Direct access to the River for water sports and recreation and is located on the Great River Road.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

David Chanski
Community Development Director
218-828-2307
dchanski@ci.brainerd.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Brainerd Riverfront Trail and Trailhead

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$230 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$230 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$40 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Buhl Water Infrastructure | 1 | GO | 2,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,720 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Buhl Water Infrastructure**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$2,720**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Buhl has identified \$3,310,100 worth of improvements to our water infrastructure. The City's current water infrastructure is in urgent need of repair.**Project Description**

The City of Buhl is requesting funds to replace deteriorating water lines and curb stops throughout the entire City. At the same time the City will replace detreating sewer lines and have partnered with Minnesota Energy to move their gas lines at the same. Completing these much needed improvements will allow Buhl to focus on economic development within the City and surrounding area.

Project Rationale

The City has already put a great deal of time and resources into this project. The City has secured funding from the IRRRB, CDBG, and USDA. The City also conducted an extensive rate study in 2018, and had the entire City televised to identified all of the problem areas.

Project Timeline

Fall 2019- Bids

Spring/Summer 2020- Construction begins

Summer of 2020- Project completion.

Other Considerations

The City of Buhl has done their due diligence in securing grant dollars for this project, but those funds are limited. The City also recognizes that we can no longer wait to replace our aging infrastructure. This project will also be a boost to the local economy.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Buhl

Who will operate the facility?

City of Buhl

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents and businesses within the City of Buhl

Public Purpose

This project will provide an enhancement to the citizens of the community by providing reliable water service.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Ryan Pervenanze
Administrator
218-258-3226
rpervenanze@cityofbuhlman.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Buhl Water Infrastructure

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,720 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$70 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,525 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$125 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,440 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$48 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$255 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$462 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,675 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,440 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Highway 212 Carver County Expansion Project | 1 | THB | 32,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Waterfront Development for Waconia Regional Park | 2 | GO | 4,300 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 36,800 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 32,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,300 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 0 | 0 |

Highway 212 Carver County Expansion Project

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$32,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$32.5 million in State funds is requested for the reconstruction of US Hwy 212 from Norwood Young America to Cologne in Carver County to expand the 2-lane rural roadway to a 4-lane divided expressway including Reduced Conflict Intersections and a grade separated overpass. US Hwy 212 is a critical transportation corridor connecting rural MN to the Metro Area, and this project will reconstruct the original pavement (1929), improve safety (2 fatalities in 2018), and address freight mobility issues.

Project Description

The project is an overdue freight mobility and safety project needed to modernize and expand an existing 1929 depression-era, 2-lane obsolete rural highway to a 4-lane modern rural expressway. The project removes a longstanding highway system gap where the 4-lane expressway facility from Glencoe moving east towards the Metro Area drops to a 2-lane undivided rural highway at Norwood Young America. Further to the east, US Highway 212 is a 4-lane divided freeway from the City of Carver (County Highway 11) to Eden Prairie (I-494). This gap and the road’s limited conditions cause mobility and safety issues and restricts access into and out of the Metro Area for economic development, freight, and rural constituents.

The proposed project will mitigate the existing gap and road conditions by building a modern 4-lane divided expressway with safe shoulders and clear zones and incorporating Reduced Conflict Intersections at key locations (Tacoma Ave., Salem Ave., County Highway 153). The proposed project also includes an overpass to serve the Bongards Creamery complex at the key County Highway 51 intersection. Project limits are from Norwood Young America (County Highway 34) to Cologne (County Highway 36). The project corridor has statewide and national significance: US Highway 212 is part of the National Highway System; the entire length of US Highway 212 in Minnesota is officially designated the Minnesota Veterans Memorial Highway; the corridor is designated as a Critical Rural Freight Corridor by MnDOT and a Tier 1 Freight Corridor by the Metropolitan Council.

The total project cost is estimated at \$65 million. This request is for 50% of the total cost or \$32.5 million. Carver County has committed \$12 million (18%) of local money towards the total project cost. Over the course of decades, multiple requests, and growth throughout the Metro, funding for this key highway serving Minnesota and the region has been hard to come by. In some sense, the project has been orphaned as a fringe project in the Metro, but also excluded from greater Minnesota consideration.

In 2017, Carver County adopted a ½ percent sales tax and \$20 excise tax on vehicle purchases to specifically finance the local share of this project. The ½ percent sales tax provides annual, non-federal revenue dedicated for transportation improvements within the County. This project is specifically identified as a high priority to receive these local funds in the County’s adopted Transportation Tax Plan, which designates eligible projects for the tax revenue. The remaining funding

would come from \$5.5 million in redirected MnDOT maintenance funding already designated for an overlay of this roadway segment in 2020 and from \$15 million in federal or other funding that would be needed to complete the full funding package.

Carver County and Southwest Corridor Transportation Coalition (SWCTC) have been pursuing funds to reduce safety issues, improve freight movement, and implement the 4-lane needed for US Highway 212 for years. However, because funding to complete the entire project is limited, Carver County, SWCTC and MnDOT have been staging safety and freight improvements and seeking assistance for project elements that could be undertaken as soon as practicable. Continued outreach and requests for support from key partners have been made including requests for the Legislature to provide significant increases in Trunk Highway funding, and to provide robust appropriations for the Corridors of Commerce program and the State Bonding package (including an allocation for requested US Highway 212 improvements).

Project Rationale

This segment of US Highway 212 saw 2 fatalities in 2018 and has a road base condition that is almost 100 years old (1929). The project has been long overdue to address highway safety, freight mobility, and pavement quality on this Critical Rural Freight Corridor (MnDOT) that, as the primary highway facility (with no Interstate or Interstate-like facility), connects over 22,000 square miles of rural western MN and South Dakota to the economic hub of the Metro Area.

This segment of US Highway 212 is a system bottleneck, safety concern, and a capacity deficiency that regularly operates at capacity with high volumes of freight moving from western Minnesota destined to the Twin Cities and the Ports of Savage. Trucks serving these multimodal facilities and other major freight generators along the corridor are forced to navigate bottleneck conditions, challenging intersections, and merge on and off 2-lane and 4-lane facilities amongst increased commuter traffic from the rural centers of Glencoe, Norwood Young America, and Cologne.

Several highway fatalities on the project section rise to the top as one of the most urgent needs and concern of impact for the project. In 2018, there were two fatalities on the project segment at/near County Highway 51. This follows two fatalities at this intersection in 2009 and a serious injury crash in 2010. Following the 2009 and 2010 crashes, turn lanes were installed as a low-cost improvement, however concerns for safe passage remain. The road's limited, sub-standard shoulders and snow drifting also create unreliable and limited conditions that continue to cause near miss and run off the road and rear-end crashes.

The state of the segment's pavement and associated facilities is also high on the list as a cause of concern and need. US Highway 212 was originally constructed in 1929, making it one of the state's older corridors and a clear predecessor of the post WW-II major road building era. Since its initial construction, the roadway has not been expanded or had any major renovations. The Depression-Era sub-grade is deteriorating the road surface at a quicker rate than typically expected. The Ride Quality Index (RQI), used by MnDOT in the 2017 Pavement Condition Annual Report to categorize performance measure categories for the NHS, is currently at a 3.0 (2017). It was projected to fall within the RQI "Fair" range, which is 2.1 to 3.0, by 2018 and continue to deteriorate until 2025, when it falls into the "Poor" category. MnDOT has programmed a pavement preservation project on this highway segment for 2020 at a cost of \$5.5 million. This is a solution to provide better pavement quality for the short-term but does not address the underlying age, base conditions, or the safety and freight mobility issues.

The project design provides a cost-effective, high-benefit solution to address basic safety, access, infrastructure, and mobility issues for one of the State's key highways—a highway that serves one of

the largest traffic sheds of any major highway in the state.

Project Timeline

Project pre-design and concept development is complete. If project design and NEPA environmental process begins in the Summer of 2019, 60% plans and NEPA approval could be complete by Spring 2020. Final Plans and Specifications and ROW Certificate would be complete by Spring of 2021. Bid / Let would be complete by June 2021. Construction would start in Fall of 2021 with expected completion by Fall of 2023.

If the project is accelerated, it could follow the same timeline as the US Highway 212 Expansion project from Cologne (CSAH 36) to Carver (CSAH 11). This project is currently programmed for FY 2022 with construction planned to begin in 2021. Combining the projects would enable cost savings through efficiencies. Accelerating the project could also allow the \$5.5 million MnDOT pavement preservation investment planned for the corridor in 2020 to be incorporated to the expansion project. If this opportunity is missed, the \$5.5 million State investment will be short-term with limited to no safety and mobility benefits compared to the full proposed expansion project.

Other Considerations

The defining need for this project is safety; there were two fatalities at and near the US Highway 212 and County Highway 51 intersection in 2018. Crash analysis shows the corridor experiences a high number of fatal and severe injury crashes. Furthermore, the existing geometry of the corridor contributes to safety issues. These issues are: the highway transitions from 4-lanes to 2-lanes; lack of turn lanes on US 212; traffic turning on to US 212; lack of passing lanes; limited right-of-way including narrow sub-standard shoulders; lack of intersection capacity and side street gaps in traffic. Crash analysis generated from 10-year crash data shows the existing annual crash cost on the project corridor is \$6,760,000. The proposed project would reduce this crash cost by 34% and reduce severe crashes by 44%. The estimated annual crash cost savings is \$2,930,000.

The proposed project incorporates snow fencing as an innovative safety measure. The open agricultural landscape of the corridor often results in increased volumes of congestion and safety hazards during snow events. Blowing and drifting snow can lead to lane blockages, icy conditions, and narrow travel lanes. Snow events tend to lead to increased crash rates, especially for run off the road crashes. In the 10-year crash data (January 2009 -January 2019), approximately 30% of the crashes occurred during snow- or ice-covered road conditions. The proposed project will include snow fencing to increase winter driving safety by creating a barrier to snow drifting during windy conditions.

A reduction in crash cost is a major component in measuring the project's benefit cost ratio. The benefit cost analysis demonstrates that the project will result in a regional and national economic benefit. The project achieves substantial travel time savings for private vehicles and freight generators, results in a significant reduction in fatal and severe injury crash occurrences, and demonstrates an operation and maintenance cost savings.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

US Highway 212 is currently a MnDOT owned right of way and facility. Carver County has partnered with MnDOT on planning and developing the proposed project. MnDOT would own the US 212 highway right of way for this project.

Who will operate the facility?

US Highway 212 is currently MnDOT owned right of way and facility. MnDOT is committed to operating and maintaining the project as part of the State highway system. Long-term maintenance operations will be performed by MnDOT based on its typical maintenance schedule for bituminous roadways. Key maintenance improvements required during the lifecycle of the project include: annual routine maintenance (Annual), thin (2-inch) bituminous mill and overlay (Year 20) and a medium (4-inch) bituminous mill and overlay (Year 35).

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be a public highway and will provide overdue basic and safe highway and economic access and mobility infrastructure to serve multiple counties, businesses, and communities from the Metro to and from rural western MN, which has no access to Interstate or Interstate-like facilities. The highway facility serves as the major highway access to the Metro Area economic hub and Ports of Savage. US Highway 212 serves 65 major business freight generators between the MN-South Dakota border and the Metro Area. This is reflected in the high percentage (11%-13%) of trucks using US Highway 212 through the project area. Increased growth in Minnesota and Carver County continues to add demands for basic, modern infrastructure and support for competitive economic development. The forecasted 2040 volumes on the project corridor range from 22,000 to 25,000. This is compared to the existing 11,000 ADT from 2017 (MnDOT). With traffic expected to more than double on the corridor, action is needed to safely accommodate the traveling public and decrease barriers to economic development in Western MN.

Public Purpose

The public purpose is to provide a safe highway for the traveling public. Two fatalities in 2018 in this sub-standard highway corridor is not acceptable for the 11,000 vehicles per day who use this stretch of highway to travel back and forth to their jobs, for trucks delivering goods, and other daily travel needs. The project will also allow economic development and business growth by providing a highway facility that addresses freight mobility needs and allow the corridor to grow to serve 22,000 to 25,000 vehicles per day.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This is not a phased project. No previous State appropriations have been made for this project.

Project Contact Person

Lyndon Robjent
Carver County Engineer, Public Works Director
952-466-5206
lrobjent@co.carver.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Highway 212 Carver County Expansion Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$32,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$606 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$644 | \$12,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,250 | \$65,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,779 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$850 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$400 | \$7,973 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$55,248 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,250 | \$65,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Waterfront Development for Waconia Regional Park

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$4,300

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: \$4.3 million in state funds is requested to predesign, design, construct, furnish and develop Lake Waconia Regional Park located in Carver County. The project provides park development on the second largest lake of the metropolitan area. Recreation, tourism, physical and mental health attributes are provided through this project. The project utilizes existing investments in land, public utilities, site grading, roads and parking lots made by the State, Metropolitan Council and Carver County.

Project Description

The proposed project is consistent with local and regional planning documents. The proposed investment would construct park buildings to facilitate the use of public lake shore property. Services to be provided include restrooms, changing rooms, shelter for picnicking, concessions, lifeguards operations, indoor social event space, and equipment rental for water based recreation. The planned development is consistent with services offered at other Metropolitan Regional Park and State Parks. In addition, the site is well prepared having already acquired the land and begun work to install city sewer and water utilities. The planned project area is shovel ready for improved parking, trails for pedestrians and bicyclists with a direct connection to downtown Waconia. Development of the park is focused on the waterfront of 3080 acre Lake Waconia, 2nd largest lake in the Metropolitan area and of state wide significance. Public demand is high for water based recreation, lake scenery and other attributes of water. Correspondingly, plans for waterfront development include expansion of the beach, a lakefront walk and fishing piers. Additionally, docking space and related parking is to be provided on the waterfront for emergency services of the County Sheriff’s Department. The water patrol boat will be conveniently located for efficient response time and lake patrol purposes.

Project Rationale

Lake Waconia Regional Park is located in one of the fastest growing counties of the state and on the 2nd largest lake in the metropolitan area. The lake has high water quality which is in tremendous demand for recreation. Currently, over 151,000 user visits are recorded annually at the park. Planning for the park has been extensive dating back to the 1970’s. Also, planning approval has been achieved through public processes at local and regional levels. The approved park master plan is incorporated into the Metropolitan Regional Parks and Open Space Policy Plan. The project is shovel ready. In order to realize the benefits of past investments in acquiring a 160 acres of park land, realigned roadways, new sewer and water lines purchased and constructed with local, county and state funds; continued and sequentially timed investment is needed to respond to public demand for services. The public will not understand why all this work has been done but buildings that are needed for core services of restrooms, shelter, and other functions are not provided. The request for state bonding addresses a need to provide near home recreational services for the metropolitan area, public safety through water patrol and federal requirements for ADA access. The request is grounded in State Statutes for Regional Recreation Open Space and Regional Recreation Policy Plan – 473.121, Subd.

14, & 473.147 Subd. 1. The Regional Parks System was created by the State. Together with the State, the Park system is to meet the outdoor recreation needs of the public. There are just two State Parks in the Twin Cities Metropolitan area with over half the state's population; the development of Lake Waconia Regional Park fulfills a need.

The current service level of providing portable restroom facilities cannot be maintained at a level that is acceptable for over \$151,000 user visits and does not meet other service needs for family and ADA accessibility. Other building related service demands include lifeguard service station, concessions, and watercraft rental services. ADA access would be improved to all areas of the park. Walkways and trails are planned in addition to compliant buildings. A trail connection to town reduces the need for motorized transportation by facilitating local bike and pedestrian traffic. The current outdated and non ADA compliant playground equipment is to be removed. A modern play facility is needed for the development of strength and social skills of youth.

Public safety would be improved for the park and on the lake; planned shelter area and restroom would provide protection from in climate weather. Additionally, current park plans provide space for the Sheriff's Dept. to dock a patrol boat on the lake at the park. The patrol service not only benefits the park but all users of the lake.

A tremendous investment has been made to assemble land on the shores of Lake Waconia for park purposes. This included the shifting of State TH 5 and realigning county roadways to improve transportation and create the physical space next to the lake for Lake Waconia Regional Park. The project request works to fully realize the investment into land, relocation of roadways and constructed public utilities.

Land acquisition is complete for the park; a development master plan for the park was approved March 8, 2017 by the Metropolitan Council. The construction of public utilities for the park and adjacent area is to be underway later summer of 2019. The County is willing to match State funds 50/50 for planning and development of the park. Without state bonding assistance, development of the park is in jeopardy.

Carver County has done a great job partnering with MNDOT, DNR, LCCMR and the Metropolitan Council, to create the space for the park and a public watercraft access.

State bonding will not only make the project possible but will be much more efficient. Economies of scale can be realized for construction buildings, parking lot improvements, playground, and trails. The capital investment makes sense as we deliver service timely to a growing population. We are taking care of what we have and utilizing investments of property and infrastructure.

Project Timeline

August 2015 - March 8, 2017 Master Planning, Public Engagement, County and Metropolitan Council Approvals (Completed)

July 2018 - present Predesign

March 2019 – June 2020 Project Coordination with Adjacent DNR Watercraft Access Site, Planning and Construction

August 2020 - Initial Permit Scoping

August 2020 - January 2021 Engineering and Design Construction Document Development

February 2021 - March 2021 Project Bidding

March 2021 - Project Award

Project permitting - March 2021

Construction April 2021 - October 2021

Other Considerations

Carver County is working collaboratively with the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to construct a public watercraft access adjacent to Lake Waconia Regional Park. This work will lead to additional users to the park seeking daylong recreation opportunities and services such as restrooms. First, the County led master planning coordination of the watercraft access with the park. Second, the County acquired the parcel of land needed for the watercraft access. Third, the County has issued an easement across a portion of Lake Waconia Regional Park to provide ingress and egress to and from the watercraft launch site now owned by the state. Fourth, the County has entered into a cooperative agreement with the State to lead design and construction of the public watercraft access. Carver County will continue to partner with the DNR to ensure operations and maintenance activities are well coordinated and cost effectively delivered for both the watercraft access and the park. Carver County has also worked collaboratively with the City of Waconia to provide municipal trunk water and sewer services to the park and to areas beyond the park boundary ensuring infrastructure is well planned and constructed for the future.

Other collaborative work with the City includes construction of a trail connection to the park underneath TH 5.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Carver County is an Implementing Regional Park Agency of the Metropolitan Regional Park System. The County finances approximately 91% of the overall operations and maintenance for the regional park and trails it manages. Approximately 9% funding for operations and maintenance comes from the state lottery in lieu of property taxes and general funds. While Implementing Regional Park Agencies expenses have increased, the State's proportion of funding for the regional park system has been flat or declined. Carver County realizes that the state may not contribute at a higher amount for operations and maintenance of the Regional Park System.

Who will own the facility?

Carver County will own the Lake Waconia Regional Park facilities. The County currently owns the land which facilities would be constructed on. As a Regional Park Implementing Agency, Carver County owns and operates two other regional parks. The facilities will be used by the public as a part of the Metropolitan Regional Park System.

Who will operate the facility?

Carver County will operate the facilities. The County currently operates two other regional parks and the facilities therein. Additionally, Carver County has demonstrated that it has the capacity to own and operate other regional parks. Carver County is an Implementing Regional Park Agency of the metropolitan area.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facilities will be staffed by Carver County and used by the public as a part of the Metropolitan Regional Park System. The County and the Metropolitan Regional Park System accept all visitors from inside and outside its jurisdictional boundary.

Public Purpose

The primary purpose is to provide public recreation. Additional benefits are also derived from the

outdoor education, environmental stewardship, social interaction, physical and mental health opportunities, and economic benefit in the form of tourism to the area. Facilities and grounds will be available to the public 365 days a year and provide essential services of potable water, restrooms, along with traditional facilities of beaches, shelters, picnic grounds, playgrounds, docks, fishing piers, and trails.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In 2018, Carver County received partial state funding of \$1.5 M of a \$5.4 M capital bonding request for Phase 1 development of Lake Waconia Regional Park. Funding by the state is matched with \$1.5M of County funds. As defined in the grant agreement SG-10782, funding was provided for predesign, design, engineering for the development of Lake Waconia Regional Park including construction of sewer and water utilities to the site, site grading, construction of a parking lot, and road improvements. The grant provided partial funding for the initial investment into infrastructure for the park.

This request continues Phase 1 development for infrastructure related to restrooms, shelters, and park amenities such as playground and trails.

Project Contact Person

Martin Walsh
Parks and Recreation Director
952-466-5252
mwalsh@co.carver.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$4.3 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Waterfront Development for Waconia Regional Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$1,500 | \$4,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$4,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$3,000 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$3,000 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$3,000 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Carver Levee | 1 | GO | 11,058 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 11,058 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 11,058 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Carver Levee

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$11,058 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$11.058 million in state funding is requested to acquire land, pre-design, design, and to construct levee improvements for the City of Carver. These improvements will correct deficiencies to the existing system to provide public safety and protect property during periods of flooding on the Minnesota River. |

Project Description

The primary goal of the proposed flood improvement project is to reestablish the integrity of the existing flood protection system for the City of Carver. This will increase public safety and protect the City's Historic Downtown and infrastructure during the 100-year flood event. Several improvements are needed to address the deficiencies and ultimately receive an "acceptable" rating from the Army Corps of Engineers. The improvements are proposed to be constructed in the same location that the existing deficiencies are currently located.

1. Correct Clear Zone Issues

Removal of brush, trees, and other excess vegetation within 15 feet clear zone of the levee is proposed to allow for visual inspections of the levee. There are structures that have been identified within the 15 foot clear zone of the levee. Structures such as fencing, sheds, etc need to be identified and moved. Where buildings are identified within the clear zone sheet piling or alignment changes to the levee will be incorporated into the design. Addressing issues with the clear zone will minimize negative effects on the performance of the levee.

2. Increase levee elevation to meet FEMA flood elevation

The top elevation for nearly 50% (~2,200 lineal feet) of the levee will need to be increased to meet the minimum FEMA freeboard requirement of three feet.

3. Correct Steep Slopes

A majority of the side slopes in the existing levee are too steep to properly maintain. Fill will be added and slopes vegetated to ensure a maximum slope of 3:1 is achieved. Additionally, fill will be added to riprapped slopes to ensure a maximum slope of 2:1 is achieved.

Project Rationale

Flooding along the Minnesota River is repetitive. Prior to the construction of the levee in the 1960s flooding inundated parts of Carver and caused significant damage and financial burden on the area. Flood damages since the installation of the levee have been greatly reduced, however flooding is occurring more often. Deficiencies in the flood protection system need to be addressed to reduce the uncertainty of the existing system and to protect the City and Historic District against repetitive flooding on the Minnesota River.

Project Timeline

The work will begin when funding is secured. It is estimate for work to begin during the winter of 2020 and construction completion in the fall of 2022.

Other Considerations

Alternatives to levee improvements include:

1. Property buyout

Given the National Historic District of the area that is protected by the levee, there is no feasible location for relocating this district.

2. Flood proofing structures

Flood proofing the structures protected by the existing flood protection system would be costly. More importantly this option would not protect the City infrastructure from flooding and the detriments associated with flooding.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

\$11.058 million request for flood improvements

Who will own the facility?

City of Carver

Who will operate the facility?

City of Carver

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Not Applicable

Public Purpose

Flood Protection

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Brent Mareck
City Manager
952-448-8737
bmareck@cityofcarver.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Carver Levee

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$11,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,058 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,058 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Implementation of Cedar River Capital Investment Plan, Phase II | 1 | GO | 2,350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Implementation of Cedar River Capital Investment Plan, Phase II**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$2,350**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$2.350 Million is requested to implement Phase 2 Cedar River Capital Improvement Project plan for implementation of flood mitigation and watershed treatment projects in the Cedar River Watershed.**Project Description**

Construction of Phase II of the CRWD Capital Improvement Plan. This includes the design, development and construction of 14 projects strategically located within the watershed. The projects will impound and/or stabilize uplands for water resource improvement and protection. The overall long term goal of the watershed is to reduce flows by 20%. The goal of the Capital Improvement plan is reduce flows by 8%

Project Rationale

The Cedar River Watershed has water quality impairments for Fecal Coliform and Total Suspended Solids. Pollution runoff is impacting the biological integrity of the stream and overall quality for the fish and wildlife opportunities. It also restricts the public involvement and use of the Cedar River and its tributaries. The watershed community has also been plagued with chronic flooding and increased damage from storm flows. The local flood damage reduction goal is 20%, coming through the city of Austin. The overall goal of the Capital Improvement Plan is to accomplish 50%-75% of that overall goal. These combined efforts will reduce flood damage and improve water quality.

Project Timeline

Phase II is proposed to begin in summer of 2020 and complete in fall of 2021

Other Considerations

The District has secured funding from local sources to match state funding 1:1

Impact on State Operating Subsidies**Who will own the facility?**

Cedar River Watershed District will own the structures, through easements on private land

Who will operate the facility?

Cedar River Watershed District

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Facilities will not be occupied

Public Purpose**Description of Previous Appropriations**

The CRWD was provided \$1.7 Million from the previous bonding bill.

Project Contact Person

Justin Hanson
District Administrator
507-434-2603
justin.hanson@mowerswcd.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Implementation of Cedar River Capital Investment Plan, Phase II

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$2,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,700 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,670 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$430 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,700 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Mississippi Crossings Park Improvement Project | 1 | GO | 6,051 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,051 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,051 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Mississippi Crossings Park Improvement Project

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$6,051

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The Mississippi Crossings Park Improvement Project is for the City of Champlin's Mississippi Point Park located in the City's Mississippi Crossings area. Mississippi Point Park's Master Plan for reconstruction includes a waterfront boat docking system, a picnic pavilion, and several other recreational amenities such as waterfront trails and an outdoor performance and community gathering area.

Project Description

Mississippi Point Park is located on the banks of the Mississippi River in Champlin at the confluence of the Rum River which heads north all the way to Mille Lacs Lake and the Elm Creek, which has a 108 mile watershed to the west. It is a historic site as well, as this is the area Father Hennepin wrote about in his journals in 1680. Mississippi Point Park's Master Plan for reconstruction includes a waterfront boat docking system, a picnic pavilion, and several other recreational amenities such as waterfront trails and an outdoor performance and community gathering area.

This proposed project will provide improvements to a regional facility that is heavily used spring, summer, and fall. The Park provides a regional boat launch and recreational facilities for the six-mile Mississippi River Upper Recreational Pool. This launch serves recreational enthusiasts in the northwest metro region along with six municipalities which include Ramsey, Anoka, Coon Rapids, Dayton, Champlin, and Brooklyn Park. The newly proposed docking designs will provide improved facilities for the recreational enjoyment of the river patrons.

The proposed project will complement the newly reconstructed Mill Pond Dam which was rebuilt in 2016. This Dam, located in Mississippi Point Park, is an attraction for fisherman and tourists as it controls the floodplain water levels on the Champlin Mill Pond and the entire 108-mile Elm Creek Watershed area. This park serves as the destination landing spot for canoe racers from the ever-growing Mighty Mississippi River Regional Canoe Race that starts in St. Cloud and Elk River and completes in Mississippi Point Park in August each year. Mississippi Point Park is the access point for both the Hennepin and Anoka County Sheriff's Department's water patrol and rescue services on the Mississippi River and the entire six-mile recreational pool. In 2001, the Department of Natural Resources partnered with the City of Champlin to create a regional parking facility for recreational boating and fishing enthusiasts in Mississippi Point Park. The proposed improvements will include renewing these parking facilities as part of the overall project.

Mississippi Point Park is part of a uniquely situated interconnected four park system. The proposed project will host regional trail connections to the Three Rivers Park District's future West Mississippi River Regional Trail (a trail that will connect Minneapolis to Otsego), and the Elm Creek Park Reserve. It will serve as the crown jewel of the four park contiguously linked area that includes both riverfront and mill pond area improvements. In addition to these trail connections, The Mississippi River Trail (MRT), is located directly adjacent to the park. Trail patrons utilize this park as a "water

touch point" for those who use the national trail that extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the headwaters of the Mississippi in Itasca State Park. Mississippi Point Park hosts a newly created Trunk Highway 169 underpass crossing that provides a safe connection for those wanting to access the park from the west side of the highway. The proposed project and new underpass will allow connections to various other trail systems throughout the City such as the Elm Creek Parkway Greenway Corridor trail system.

Finally, Mississippi Point Park will incorporate a picnic pavilion for families to rent on the river. There is continual requests and needs for areas to host gatherings and events. The proposed performance area and plaza will allow the Parks and Recreation Department to host live entertainment on the riverfront for all to enjoy and build a sense of community. Improvements more specifically include an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible boat docking system, site grading for ADA accessibility, shoreline stabilization, parking and trails.

Project Rationale

Mississippi Point Park is a sub-segment of the city of Champlin's larger Mississippi Crossings project that already has over \$15 Million invested in improving public riverfront property and acquiring land in the overall area since 1999. The Grant would provide a mechanism to fund the regional park improvements designed to serve the six-mile recreational river pool and holds a significant level of regional importance for recreation, waterfront access and tourism activities.

The funding would assist in the construction of both regional and state trail connections that unite patron bicyclists/tourists to this national scenic riverway destination origin. The funding would fulfill objectives the City of Champlin's regional partner, (Three Rivers Park District) has that include adjoining these trail segments to experience the Mississippi River's natural and scenic beauty.

Project Timeline

The project timeline would include:

1. Notification of funding award from State of MN in spring of 2020
2. City Council order plans and specifications to be created summer of 2020
3. Project is competitively bid by contracting firms in late summer/fall of 2020
4. Project begins in the spring of 2021
5. Project is complete by fall of 2021.

Other Considerations

The City has invested nearly \$5 Million in excavating and creating a new fishery in the distal portions of the Elm Creek and Mill Pond area in 2017. This is adjacent to Mississippi Point Park and will also be a regional draw for fisherman and kayak/canoe patrons in the area. The Mill Pond Dam was a 2016 project also in Mississippi Point Park that was a \$7 Million project undertaken by the City to support residents along the Elm Creek and renew the area for safety and water-shed utility into the Mississippi River.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City of Champlin is requesting \$6,051,000 to complete the proposed project in Mississippi Point Park. The adjacent D. C. Chandler is another park project on the Mississippi River that will require the City to provide an additional \$6-7 Million to complete. This project would be intended for 2024.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Champlin

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Champlin

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Northwest Metro residents will be the main patrons utilizing the park. Residents from Ramsey, Anoka, Coon Rapids, Brooklyn Park, Dayton, and Champlin will be those occupants most anticipated to make use of these facilities.

Public Purpose

Mississippi Point Park will serve a regional area for those citizens desiring to access the Mississippi River. The boat launch is not only recreation purposed, but serves a safety and rescue purpose with the Sheriffs offices for two counties. The docking system will allow boaters to access the park for entertainment and dining activities. The park serves fisherman a place to fish on the shorelines of the park.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None for the proposed project.

Project Contact Person

Charles Lehn
Parks and Facilities Manager
763-923-7163
clehn@ci.champlin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Mississippi Crossings Park Improvement Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,051 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$236 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$236 | \$6,051 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$75 | \$959 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$11 | \$5,092 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$236 | \$6,051 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Lyman Boulevard Improvements - Galpin Boulevard to West of Hwy 41 | 1 | GO | 729 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 729 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 729 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Lyman Boulevard Improvements - Galpin Boulevard to West of Hwy 41**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$729**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: Lyman Boulevard is a Carver County road and this segment is the last section needing improvement. The project will be constructed under a joint power agreement between Carver County, the City of Chaska, and the City of Chanhassen. The total project cost is estimated to be \$6.8M of which the City of Chanhassen is responsible for \$2.2M. The City is utilizing \$1.5M in municipal state aid funds to partially fund the City's share of the cost. The remaining balance of \$700k is being requested.

Project Description

This project consists of the reconstruction of 1.05 miles of County State Aid Highway 18 from a two-lane rural section roadway to a two-lane urban section roadway with concrete curb and gutter. It also includes the construction of new roundabouts at three (3) locations which are TH41, Peavey Road and Norex Drive. The roadway will be constructed to a 10-ton per axle design which will require the removal and replacement of poor soils in the area. The project will also include a pedestrian trail along the north side of Lyman Boulevard as well as various storm water treatment improvements.

Project Rationale

Lyman Boulevard is a key component for the regional transportation network. It benefits both the cities of Chaska and Chanhassen as well as the greater Carver County area. The County made two Federal Grant applications for this project with support from the cities but they were not successful. Traffic volumes on this roadway are increasing every year and are expected to nearly double over the next twenty years. The 2015 ADT was 6,000 and it is estimated that the 2040 ADT will be 11,200.

Project Timeline

The project timeline is as follows:

- Final Design: Complete
- Construction begins: Spring 2021
- Construction complete: Fall 2021

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

Lyman Boulevard (County Road 18) is a county road and will continue to be owned by Carver County.

Who will operate the facility?

Carver County will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Lyman Boulevard (County Road 18) will be used by the general public.

Public Purpose

The project is needed to improve safety and mobility along the corridor.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Jason Wedel
Public Works Director/City Engineer
952-227-1169
jwedel@ci.chanhassen.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Lyman Boulevard Improvements - Galpin Boulevard to West of Hwy 41

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$729 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$3,105 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$2,264 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,598 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,004 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$624 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,180 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$790 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,598 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Highway 41 Regional River Crossing and Historic Downtown Corridor Improvement Project | 1 | THB | 6,040 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,040 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 6,040 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Highway 41 Regional River Crossing and Historic Downtown Corridor Improvement Project

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$6,040

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Chaska, with support from MnDOT and Carver County, requests \$6 million in state bond funds to close the funding gap on this \$23.6 million project which preserves the mobility of a regionally significant Minnesota River crossing and revitalizes the Highway 41 "Main Street" corridor through Historic Downtown Chaska. The collaborative agency partnership has resulted in a sustainable vision that is 74% funded and mitigates the need to relocate the regional river crossing.

Project Description

This project includes \$23.6 million in improvements that supports increased safety and mobility on the Highway 41 Regional River Crossing & Historic Downtown Corridor. Highway 41 is designated as a Tier Three corridor on the Minnesota freight network. This corridor is a critical link for over 2,250 heavy commercial vehicles per day and many regional travel patterns through downtown Chaska and one of four Minnesota River crossings in the region. A one-mile buffer of Highway 41, through Carver County and reaching into Hennepin and Scott Counties, demonstrates there are 14,000 jobs that rely on this corridor, which is 35% of employment in Carver County.

Locally, Highway 41 facilitates the movement of goods to and from the City of Chaska's industrial areas (see Appendix A). The existing and well-established Highway 41 North industrial park provides over 5,000 jobs generating hundreds of trucks per day. In addition, the City of Chaska is actively marketing a significant industrial growth within an area known as the Southwest growth area that is comprised of 375 acres of future industrial development. Today, private investments are being made in this area and will one-day support and additional 5,000 jobs and generate many more trucks.

Partnership

The City of Chaska has been working with MnDOT and Carver County for the past four years on the planning for the Highway 41 improvements through downtown. Through these efforts, the project partners have reached a sustainable vision for the corridor and now the focus is getting that vision funded and constructed. Project partners have committed funds and secured grants through the Minnesota Highway Freight Program (MNHFP) and the Transportation Economic Development Infrastructure (TEDI) program equating to 74% of the funding needed. The remaining \$6M funding gap has been difficult to fill with other funding sources and a burden far greater than \$6M lies on the City of Chaska, population of 23,700. See Appendix B for letters of support from the project partners and others.

Highway 41 Corridor Safety & Mobility

Today there are no dedicated turn lanes on Highway 41 in the downtown and all left and right turning

traffic south of County Highway 61 turn from the through lanes. With traffic volumes over 18,800 vehicles per day this causes much disruption and delays. Freight haulers are commonly stuck behind turning traffic as it is unsafe for them to perform quick lane changes. In addition, vehicles often travel at higher speeds through the downtown to get in front of freight haulers before the lane reduction south of the Minnesota River crossing.

The safety concerns of the downtown and freight corridor are further amplified with the presence of parallel parking along Highway 41, which causes significant delays and unexpected vehicle movements as the entire driving lane adjacent to the parking lane becomes unusable during parking maneuvers. In addition, the drivers who choose to parallel park along the corridor exit their cars immediately adjacent to a high traffic roadway with elevated truck volumes and few gaps in traffic. This presents a safety concern for both the individual exiting their vehicle as well as passing drivers who may need to quickly merge to avoid a swinging car door or pedestrian. Loss of on-street parking will be mitigated by city investment in public parking lots just off the corridor and behind the street facing businesses. This will provide for safer and less stressful parking conditions for business patrons.

All of these elements – lack of turning lanes, high speed traffic jockeying for position, large fluctuations of speeds, and the mix of pedestrians and bicyclists provide a corridor that has so many things occurring simultaneously that the risk for crashes is high. In fact, the existing crash rate is 80% higher than the state average for similar corridors.

The proposed improvements, as shown in Appendix A, best utilize the 80 feet of right-of-way through Downtown Chaska. The vision includes eliminating all Highway 41 parking, providing right and left turning lanes at every public street intersection (if not blocked by median), and providing a single lane of continuous through travel for each direction. This recommended vision will serve the traffic reliably and safely.

The Downtown Vision was tested and proven through extensive modeling and the use of crash modification factors that were evaluated and confirmed through the study efforts. The proposed improvements will remove approximately ten crashes per year from the corridor increasing safety and reducing the additional delay as a result of a crash.

Deteriorating Highway 41 Pavement Condition

Highway 41 pavement needs replacement. The installation of a median through downtown approximately 10 years ago was completed by saw cutting along the roadway and then patching alongside the new median. The pavement is in poor condition, especially along these cuts that are in the wheel tracks of both north and south bound vehicles. MnDOT had a pavement preservation project scheduled for 2019 (in the current STIP) but has chosen to delay that project and commit those funds towards this project proposed in this funding request (see Appendix B for MnDOT's letter of support).

Highway 41 at County Highway 61 Intersection

Significant mobility and safety improvements are proposed at this very busy intersection of two Tier Three corridors on the Minnesota freight network. This intersection is currently operating at capacity in the evening rush hour that will exceed capacity in the future. The increases in traffic on both Highway 41 and County Highway 61 will cause delays creating lengthy vehicle backups. To accommodate the growing demands, all approaches to the intersection will see capacity expansions with additional turn lanes and/or longer turn lanes and new signals. These improvements ensure that turning movements do not conflict with through traffic and all movements are able to freely move through the intersection.

Delays will be reduced at the intersection from 82 seconds per vehicle to 43 seconds of delay per vehicle with no failing movements with future traffic volumes. Vehicle queues will be contained within the proposed turn lane lengths. Freight haulers will benefit from improved fuel economy as well as decreased travel times.

Highway 41 North of County Highway 61

Highway 41 north of County Highway 61 immediately serves a redeveloping commercial area and the recent \$28M investment in Fireman's Park, Chaska Curling Center, and Chaska Event Center. This community investment has drastically increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic in addition to growing highway traffic and brings more people downtown. The proposed median will provide access management and improve safety and operations of traffic. A Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon is proposed at Walnut Street to make the many pedestrians crossing this intersection more visible to the five lanes of traffic at this intersection

Results of Investment

The Highway 41 improvements through downtown will contribute to revitalization of Historic Downtown Chaska and provide significant safety and mobility benefits for all users, including the movement of freight through this constrained downtown environment. A summary of the improvements follows:

- Reliable and safe travel through Downtown Chaska and to the Minnesota River crossing
- Turn lanes at all public street intersections (most intersections have no turn lanes today)
- Elimination of high-speed weaving traffic
- Significant reduction in blocked travel lanes
- Expanded median and access control
- Removal of all Highway 41 on-street parking
- Lane width reductions greatly reduce pedestrian exposure to highway traffic
- Improved "Main Street" aesthetics and pedestrian areas
- Expansion of sidewalks at the intersection corners improves sightlines and truck turning radius'
- Provides transportation and quality of life needs for a healthy business environment
- Promotes private investment in new businesses and reinvestment in existing properties to revitalize the historic downtown
- New signals for more efficient operations
- Intersection expansion and operational improvements at County Highway 61
- Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon at Walnut Street
- Replace deteriorating pavement and utilities simultaneously

Project Rationale

Importance of Route

Highway 41 is a principal arterial roadway carrying 18,800 vehicles per day over the one of the few Minnesota River crossings and through downtown Chaska. 2,250 (12%) of these are heavy commercial vehicles. The highway is an important freight corridor for the region, designated as a Tier Three corridor in the Metropolitan Council's Truck Freight Corridor Study, which connects to County Highway 61 which is also a Tier Three corridor. The majority of truck movements on Highway 41 are a result of the river crossing, regional freight demands, gravel and sand mining, landfill traffic, and seasonal grain deliveries from western Minnesota to the Ports of Savage.

The Highway 41 corridor provides one of four Minnesota River crossings in the southwestern metro

connecting Highway 169, County Highway 61, and Highway 212. Locally, Highway 41 serves as the “Main Street” for downtown Chaska known as Chestnut Street. Due to the Minnesota River crossing, Highway 41 is just one of a few Principal Arterial roadways directly traversing a downtown in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Region. Relocating the river crossing has been studied but there are no plans to preserve the needed land for the new corridor, nor is there funding identified in the foreseeable future. Four years ago, all agencies agreed that the future traffic demands on Highway 41 must be accommodated on the existing alignment through the Downtown corridor. In addition, Scott County is leading interchange construction on Highway 41 at Highway 169 today. This will only make this route more attractive to freight movement.

Ongoing Investments in Downtown

Chaska’s mission statement is “To be the Best Small Town in Minnesota”. Chaska citizens view downtown as the heart of the community and physical embodiment of Chaska’s historic and unique small-town character. The community strives to maintain its small-town character and sense of community while supporting well planned future growth.

Chaska’s Downtown Vision is to “Revitalize downtown Chaska as the hub of community destinations and gathering places that reflect and celebrate our historic character, traditional small-town atmosphere and values.”

The City has consistently made downtown revitalization a community priority. Chaska has a strong legacy of downtown revitalization efforts over the years. These revitalization efforts include renovation of City Square, street improvements, historic preservation, site assembly and redevelopment, housing development, and storefront rehabilitation loan program. Some recent and upcoming investments (aside from this project) include:

- \$30M in downtown infrastructure improvements
- \$28M in the development of Fireman’s Park, Chaska Curling Center, and Chaska Event Center
- A future redevelopment of an entire block called City Square West within the next 5 years
- A future redevelopment adding a new library within the next 5 years
- There have been many private investments in the downtown area as well. Upon completion of this project the city anticipates further reinvestment into downtown.

In addition, Scott County is leading the \$45M Highway 41 at Highway 169 interchange, south of the river crossing. This interchange will make the Highway 41 river crossing more attractive to trucks accessing the industrial areas along Highway 169, the Ports of Savage, and the greater state and national highway system.

Secondary Benefits of Investment

Having a growing community with a thriving downtown does attract further investments. The following are just a few of the immediate economic centers along the Highway 41 corridor that account for jobs and tax base generators, but the impact is not limited to the City of Chaska or Carver County. The impact reaches further into the Highway 41 corridor into Hennepin and Scott Counties and the greater metropolitan area.

- Chaska Brickyards is a redeveloping commercial area is currently seeing over \$4M in private investments in the next few years that lead to the creation of 60 committed jobs, preserves 50 jobs, and promote continued redevelopment and job growth opportunities. Full redevelopment of the Brickyards would result in an estimated 22% increase in property taxes for the commercial area.
- Highway 41 North industrial park provides over 5,000 jobs and generates hundreds of truck trips each day. The Metropolitan Council estimated in a Regional Truck Highway Corridor Study (2017) that this industrial area generates up to \$950M in freight value each year.

- Southwest Growth Area is comprised of 375 acres of prime industrial property. Private investments in this area are occurring but the full development of this area, that would account for a total of 5,000 jobs, relies on accessibility of the Highway 41 and regional river crossing corridor.

Project Timeline

For the past four years (2016-2019) the project partners have been planning for the Highway 41 improvements through downtown which resulted in a preliminary design layout approved by Chaska City Council, Carver County, and MnDOT. Pending securing the \$6 million funding gap, final design will begin in Summer 2020 and be completed by December 2021. A year and half of final design will allow necessary time to submit milestone reviews to MnDOT and receive final approval by all agencies in time to be advertised for construction bids in January 2022. Right-of-way acquisition will begin Summer 2020 in order to begin construction by May 2022. The proposed improvements will take two construction seasons to substantially complete by Fall 2023.

Other Considerations

Through an extensive partnership, the City of Chaska, Carver County, and MnDOT have developed a vision for Historic Downtown Chaska. The city lead study was completed in Fall 2017 and identified the problems, set goals and objectives, completed extensive traffic modeling, developed and evaluated a full range of concepts, while engaging the public and Downtown business community. **On September 27th, 2017 the project team, and all partners received the APA Partnerships in Planning Award highlighting the extensive partnership to achieve the vision.** In addition to award recognition, see Appendix B for the many letters of support from agencies, legislators, and local businesses that recognize the need and importance of this project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The project will not have an impact on operating budgets.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT owns Highway 41, Carver County owns County Highway 61, City of Chaska owns all the local elements of the project. Funds from this request will be invested on non-trunk highway expenses in the development and delivery of the overall project.

Who will operate the facility?

Details of a future maintenance agreement between MnDOT, Carver County, and the City will be determined during project development to define how the improvements will be maintained for the project's useful life.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Project improvements will be entirely for public use including Chaska residents, downtown business patrons, the 14,000 employees who rely on travel through the corridor, and regional commuters and freight haulers.

Public Purpose

The improvements for safety and mobility on the Highway 41 corridor will serve all users by providing reliable connections for employment, freight generating facilities, and goods and services, as well as improving the health of the community and making downtown a beautiful place that will see reinvestment.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City of Chaska has not received any previous appropriations of State Bond funds related to this request.

Project Contact Person

Matt Podhradsky
City Administrator
952-448-9200
mpodhradsky@chaskamn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Highway 41 Regional River Crossing and Historic Downtown Corridor Improvement Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$6,040 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$6,625 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$3,063 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$3,841 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$23,569 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,009 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$3,571 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$18,989 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$23,569 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | N/A |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II | 1 | GO | 9,728 | 0 | 0 | 9,728 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 9,728 | 0 | 0 | 9,728 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 9,728 | 0 | 0 | 9,728 | 0 | 0 |

Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$9,728

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$9.728 million in state funds is requested to complete Phase II renovations to the land and buildings known collectively as the Chatfield Center for the Arts located in Chatfield, Minnesota. This funding will complete the rehabilitation of the 1916 former high school building, the 1936 auditorium building, the structure linking the two buildings, landscaping, etc. This project will complete modernization of all spaces within the buildings, then realizing the Center's full potential.

Project Description

In 2014, the Minnesota Legislature appropriated partial funding in the amount of \$5,352,000 to the Chatfield Economic Development Authority to pre-design, design, renovate, furnish, and equip improvements to the Chatfield Center for the Arts project, which generally included the renovation of Potter Auditorium, the installation of an elevator, and improvements to the mechanical and electrical systems, along with other amenity improvements. Since the Legislature realized that the 2014 allocation was not adequate to address all of the needs, the Chatfield EDA was invited to make a supplemental application for the balance of the funding needed, which is estimated to be \$9,728,000.

The Phase II project scope generally consists of demolition of the existing and construction of a new link between Potter Auditorium and the 1916 building, demolition of a small garage facility on the premises that is not original to the property and no longer functional, renovations to the 1916 school building and 1936 auditorium, restoration of the 1916 school building skylights, add/improve restroom facilities throughout the building, landscaping, improvements to parking areas, mechanical/electrical/HVAC and other building systems improvements, and repairs to the north facade of the 1916 school building.

The total cost for Phase II renovations, including associated professional fees and contingencies, are estimated at \$9,728,000.

- Total square feet of current facilities: 40,863
- Total square feet to be renovated: 15,139
- Total square feet to be added to existing facilities: 3,071
- Predesign was completed in 2015

Project Rationale

The Chatfield Center for the Arts provides southeast Minnesota with a 21st Century regional arts center which bolsters the economy and livability of the region for residents and visitors alike. The Center lends to a more sustainable community, a stronger regional employee base and enhances the livability of Southeast Minnesota. Specific goals include:

- To complete the facility renovations the 2014 appropriation did not include.

- To create a regional arts center that will not only benefit the residents of Chatfield, but Southeast Minnesota as well.
- To complete the restoration of Potter Auditorium and construct the "link" between both Potter Auditorium and the 1916 school building.
- To improve the 1916 school building and facility grounds/parking areas so that such spaces can fully function and support large events in Potter Auditorium or support multiple events throughout the Center for the Arts, at the same time.
- To create space in a regionally central location for community events and gatherings such as theater, music, weddings, concerts, and conferences.
- To create a catalyst for business and economic development in the region.
- To create a venue capable of hosting productions and crowds of regional significance.
- Nurturing individuals, creating a sustainable community, maintaining a strong regional employee base and enhancing the livability of Southeast Minnesota.

The mission is to create a sustainable attraction for culture, education, entertainment, and economic development that will enhance the quality of life for residents in the region while preserving the historical importance of the most prominent, architecturally significant, and well known building in downtown Chatfield.

Project Timeline

- Funding awarded: May 2020
- Phase II Schematic Design: July 2020 - September 2020
- Design Development: November 2020 - January 2021
- Develop Construction Documents: February 2021 - May 2021
- Bidding/Contract Award: June 2021
- Construction Begins: July 2021
- Construction Ends: May 2022
- Occupancy: June 2022

Other Considerations

None.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

The Chatfield Economic Development Authority

Who will operate the facility?

Chatfield Center for the Arts, Inc. operates the facility. This non profit organization entered into a lease agreement with the Chatfield Economic Development Authority; this lease was approved by the Commissioner of Management and Budget.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Chatfield Center for the Arts, Inc. will occupy the facility for operations/staffing/event purposes on an ongoing basis. Private use of the space is expected to be limited to short term uses such as conferences, workshops, parties, etc... under the supervision and direction of the Chatfield Center for the Arts, Inc.

Public Purpose

Economic and community development, heritage preservation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In 2014, the legislature appropriated \$5.352 million to the Chatfield Economic Development Authority to pre-design, design, renovate, furnish, and equip what was then called Phase II and IV (now collectively referred to as Phase I) of the Chatfield Center for the Arts project, which generally included the renovation of Potter Auditorium and the installation of an elevator. Also included in this appropriation were seating and amenity improvements, improvements to the mechanical and electrical systems, and other general improvements to the facility and grounds of the Chatfield Center for the Arts. Pre-design was completed with the 2014 appropriation.

It was the intent of the Legislature to only fund portions of the renovation project in 2014 and have Chatfield apply for additional funding to complete the project in the future.

Project Contact Person

Joel Young
City Clerk
507-867-3810
jyoung@ci.chatfield.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$9.728 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$5,352 | \$9,728 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$8,664 | \$5,946 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$30 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$254 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$14,300 | \$15,674 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$8,295 | \$5,946 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$44 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$514 | \$1,064 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$187 | \$169 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$4,327 | \$7,696 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$933 | \$799 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$14,300 | \$15,674 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| US Highway 8 - Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements | 1 | THB | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | THC | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chisago County District Courts - Courtroom Sound System Replacement and Upgrade | 2 | GF | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 50,080 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Cash (THC) Total | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

US Highway 8 - Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$50,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** In a state-local partnership, Chisago County seeks \$50 Million in State funds and will serve as the lead agency and project sponsor for MNDOT's development, engineering, right-of-way acquisition and construction of critically needed safety, capacity and access improvements to US Highway 8.**Project Description**

Following other successful state-local partnership efforts and building upon initial 2018 State approval and funding, Chisago County will serve as the lead agency and project sponsor for MNDOT's completion of a corridor Master Plan, interim access management plan, design, engineering and right-of-way services, and construction of critically-needed safety, capacity and access improvements to US Highway 8, from Greenway Ave to Karmel Ave in Chisago County.

In anticipation of this project, a Capacity Expansion Study was initiated by MNDOT in 2008, with an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for a 4-lane divided roadway completed in 2013. Other alternative long-term capacity designs considered by MNDOT include 2+1 passing lanes, a 4-lane expressway, and pedestrian and bicycle pathway separation and crossings.

Estimating a \$62 Million total project cost, the Governor and State Legislature approved \$3 Million in 2018 to begin project efforts, including completion of a Corridor Master Plan update and undertaking preliminary design, engineering and environmental work. In addition, MNDOT has an estimated \$9 Million already set aside for a scheduled 2023 resurfacing project for this segment. Requested is \$50 Million from state sources to cover right-of-way acquisition and trunk highway construction costs associated with this project. Additional funding for local agency costs will be solicited and acquired from other available state and local sources.

Project Rationale

Spanning east-central Minnesota from Forest Lake to St. Croix Falls, WI, U.S. Highway 8 represents the single most important transportation corridor for tens of thousands of residents, visitors and business travelers. As one of the fastest growing areas in Minnesota, Chisago County and its wonderful communities rely upon US Highway 8 (US 8) for everything from commuting to public transit, from access to business and shopping to leisure travel, and from journeying to and from school to delivering public safety services. Yet increased use and reliance on US 8 has only exacerbated existing, underlying safety issues, stretched its already overtaxed capacity, and further constricted access controls and future improvements critical for community and economic development.

Labeled for many years as Minnesota's "highway of death," US 8 has seen some critical safety improvements, beginning in 2004. While the average number and severity of crashes has decreased

with these limited improvements, crash rates on US 8, including fatal crashes, remained higher than similar rural 2-lane roadways and rural 4-lane expressways for the 2008-12 study period (2014 MnDOT Audit, p.11).

Additionally, the 2014 analysis of crashes along US 8 showed that five of 13 intersections (nearly 40%) were rated as exceeding both the severity rate and critical rate for number and severity of crashes (2008-12 period), despite two prior MnDOT improvement projects (Audit, p. 18-19).

Limited federal and state funding has left roads like US 8 grossly insufficient for the needs of both today's and tomorrow's Minnesotans. With no recent capacity improvements undertaken and none planned, nearly every segment of US 8 is already well above its capacity in current annual average daily traffic counts (AADT). Moreover, segments along the western third are approaching 200% of system capacity and nearing MnDOT's 2030 AADT estimates (Audit, p. 9).

Finally, controlling and improving access remains a top priority for both corridor safety and current and future community and economic development. MnDOT's 2014 Audit recommended short-, medium- and long-term strategies (p. 24-26), to include intersection closures/controls, signal interconnection and controls, and median improvements.

Project Timeline

2018-19: Completion of a corridor Master Plan update, preliminary engineering and environmental review requirements.

2020-21: Design, Engineering and Right-Of-Way Services

2022-23: Trunk highway Construction

Other Considerations

Chisago County remains one of the fastest growing areas in Minnesota. Continued population growth, economic development and significant construction activity along this segment of US 8 are only exacerbating existing safety, capacity and access concerns.

Additionally, well-planned transportation investments foster economic growth through the provision of a commerce-friendly network of corridors to ship goods and provide mobility to citizens. Significant economic development opportunities along the entire US 8 corridor await needed safety, access and traffic flow improvements, ranging from residential and commercial/retail development to new and expanded industrial and manufacturing activities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

MNDOT is already responsible for operations, maintenance and upkeep of US Highway 8. Modification and/or expansion of this segment of US Highway may increase future annual operations and maintenance costs, as well as future capital upkeep costs.

Who will own the facility?

State of Minnesota - MN Department of Transportation

Who will operate the facility?

State of Minnesota - MN Department of Transportation

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Transportation asset/public use.

Public Purpose

Public transportation asset/public use.

Description of Previous Appropriations

2018 State Bonding appropriation of \$3 Million for initiation of project efforts, including completion of a Corridor Master Plan update and undertaking preliminary design, engineering and environmental work.

Project Contact Person

Chase Burnham
Chisago County Interim Administrator
651-213-8830
chase.burnham@chisagocounty.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

US Highway 8 - Safety, Capacity and Access Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Trunk Highway Cash | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$3,000 | \$50,000 | \$9,000 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$8,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$34,000 | \$9,000 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$3,000 | \$50,000 | \$9,000 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Chisago County District Courts - Courtroom Sound System Replacement and Upgrade**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$80**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** Requested is \$80,000 in State G.O. Bonds to match local levy dollars to upgrade the Audio Sound System in the four (4) Chisago County Courtrooms occupied and utilized by the District (State) Courts.**Project Description**

Requested is \$80,000 in State G.O. Bonds to match local levy dollars to upgrade the Audio Sound System in the four (4) Chisago County Courtrooms occupied and utilized by the District (State) Courts. The original system was installed in 1989 and has reached the end of its usable life. Mandated recording and accessibility requirements and desired features requested by the Counts necessitate significant capital investment. Neither property-tax poor Chisago County nor the MN State Courts have budgeted funds for the undertaking of such an expensive and unplanned capital project.

Project Rationale

The current audio system present in the Chisago County Courtrooms was installed in 1989 and has reached the end of its usable life. Neither Chisago County nor the Minnesota Judicial Branch/10th Judicial District have capital funding sources sufficient to undertake the required replacement and desired upgrades.

Proposed is an integrated audio solution to address both required audio standards and accessibility requirements for MN courtrooms and contemporary optional features requested by the District Courts. Specifically:

A new Digital Signal Processor will be installed and provide Acoustic Echo Cancellation, audio routing, VoIP interface, auto gain control, equalization and audio to/from. An audio input from the Clerk's PC will be included to provide playback of the pre-recorded Rights Recording.

The existing six gooseneck microphones will be reused. One (1) microphone will be provided for the Judge and Witness and two (2) microphones will be provide at each attorney table. A compact boundary microphone will be located on the top-front on the Bench for Side Bar pickup. When a Side Bar is initiated white noise will be routed to all gallery, jury, witness and attorney loudspeakers for privacy. Three (3) new wireless microphones with AES 256-bit encryption-enabled for secure transmission will be installed and will be configured as two (2) lavalier systems and one (1) handheld system. It is understood the handheld microphone will be used for the jury.

To provide a mix-minus audio system, compact loudspeakers with local volume controls will be mounted in angled desktop enclosures and will be provided for the Judge, Clerk, Recorder, each attorney table and the Witness. A headphone level audio output will be located in the Clerk's enclosure to be connected to a headphone. The OFE ceiling mounted loudspeakers will be used for the gallery and the jury. All other ceiling speakers will be bypassed. To help reduce the possibility of feedback, the audio system will be configured as a "mix-minus" system where the audio from the local microphone will not be reproduced by the adjacent loudspeaker. The existing speaker in the holding

cell will be reused. A two- channel Infrared (IR) assisted listening system (ALS) will be provided with the emitter mounted onto the front wall.

VoIP teleconferencing will be provided with all room speakers reproducing the far-end audio. A wall plate will be installed in the floor box below the existing video teleconferencing (VTC) cart to provide audio to/from the ITV CODEC. All room speakers reproducing the far-end audio during a video conference call. The on-board AEC of the CODEC must be turned off and the TV audio must be muted or disconnected.

USB audio from the DSP will be routed to the Clerk's and Recorder's PCs for multi-channel recording purposes. An SD/USB two-channel recorder will be mounted under the table at the Clerk's desk. Note the audio playback Rights Recording PC and the audio recorder are to be located at the same location.

A control system will be provided with two (2) 10" tabletop touch panels. One touch panel will be located at the Clerk's desk and one will be located at the Recorder's desk. The touch panel graphical user interfaces (GUI) will be identical. Controls programmed will include:

- Wireless Microphone volume controls (3) with mute
- VTC controls
- Teleconferencing controls
- Microphone Mute. This will mute all microphones with the exception of the Judge.
- Side Bar
- Program audio volume controls
- Ceiling speaker volume controls
- Holding Cell On/Off and volume controls

Note the Judge, witness, attorney, Recorder and Clerk's speakers each have a local volume control. The audio recorder will be controlled from the unit's front panel.

For all Courtrooms, the new DSP will be configured to provide Distance Court Interpretation (DCI) conferencing. DCI configuration will be included in the audio system DSP replacement. In addition, Mode 3 DCI will be provided by two (2) wireless transceivers/headsets with one (1) located at the Defense table and one (1) provided for the Witness. A docking station with an additional transceiver will be provided to interface with the DSP.

Project Timeline

- May 2020 - Legislative Approval of Bonding Request
- June 2020 - RFP for Equipment Procurement and Installation Services
- July 2020 - Funding Available and Project Bid Awarded
- September 2020 - Project Installed & Completed

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Neither the State of Minnesota nor the MN State Courts pay any portion of facility capital expenses for local County District Courts.

Who will own the facility?

Chisago County MN

Who will operate the facility?

MN State Courts/10th Judicial District/Chisago County District Court

Who will use or occupy the facility?

- NA -

Public Purpose

Facility and operational equipment required to provide judicial and court services under the MN State Courts.

Description of Previous Appropriations

- NA -

Project Contact Person

Chase Burnham
Chisago County Interim Administrator
651-213-8830
chase.burnham@chisagocounty.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Chisago County District Courts - Courtroom Sound System Replacement and Upgrade

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$80 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$80 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$160 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$160 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$160 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Public Safety Building | 1 | GO | 8,922 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ice Arena and Curling Club | 2 | GO | 2,612 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 11,534 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 11,534 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Public Safety Building**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$8,922 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$8.922 million in state funds is requested to construct, furnish and equip a new Public Safety Building for the City of Chisholm Police and Fire Departments. |

Project Description

A 24,300 square foot building is proposed to house our Police and Fire Departments. The estimated total cost is \$8,922,000. The Fire Department will occupy approximately 15,900 square feet and the Police Department 8,400 square feet.

Project Rationale

Our current Public Safety Building is over 100 years old and the building was designed for horse drawn fire equipment. Currently custom built equipment needs to be purchased to fit in the narrow doors. After an incident there is not adequate room to recover with cleaning the equipment. There are 5 apparatus squeezed into a building designed for 3. There is not adequate ventilation when the fire apparatus is started in the fire hall. The fire gear is located in the back of the hall soaking up the cancer causing exhaust while staff is dressing to respond to an emergency. The Police Department is housed in the back of the building and gets saturated with the exhaust. State Highway #73 passes right in front of the fire hall on the town's main street and due to traffic, at times there are delays in response getting the fire apparatus out of the fire hall. We cannot get the equipment out far enough for the traffic to see our emergency lighting. The Police Department is located in back of the fire hall and use a side door for entrance. The entrance is not handicap accessible. The entrance was designed in the early 1900's which makes it impossible to secure. This makes for a walk-in department whereas today most police entrances are secured with bullet proof glass. The one entrance is the only way in and out of the police department. There is no other fire exit in case of emergency. There have been times when suspects, witnesses and victims cross paths within a few feet of each other. The building's foundation is crumbling and deteriorating and the HVAC system is substandard.

Project Timeline

Bid documents completed by the end of 2019. Construction estimated to take 9 to 12 months during 2020 and into 2021 depending on when financing is obtained.

Other Considerations

The City of Chisholm provides fire coverage to the City of Chisholm, Balkan Township and Unorganized Brown Community. We provide Mutual Aid to the surrounding areas of Hibbing, Buhl, French (Side Lake Area), Kinney Great Scott, Evergreen, Saint Louis County Rescue Squad, DNR, and the US Forest Service. The Fire and Police Departments are currently looking to expand upon collaboration efforts with the neighboring community of Buhl. Due to the large group of tourists that snowmobile, hunt, fish, bicycle, ATV, ski, hike, and boat to name a few, there is a need for a larger

facility to house specialized equipment to respond to these incidents.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will operate the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Chisholm Police and Fire Departments

Public Purpose

Public Health and Safety

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

William (Bill) Manney
Clerk-Treasurer/Administrator
218-254-7902
bmanney@ci.chisholm.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Public Safety Building

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$8,922 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,922 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$90 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$710 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$7,550 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$125 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$447 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,922 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Ice Arena and Curling Club**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$2,612**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** \$2,612,000 in state funds is requested to replace the ice plant, floors and dehumidification systems for the Chet Tomassoni Chisholm Hockey Arena and the Chisholm Curling Club (Home of USA Olympic Gold Medalist Skip, John Shuster).**Project Description**

Replacement and upgrades to replace the existing ice plant with a new 120 ton capacity plant to serve the ice arena and curling club. The new plant would be an ammonia plant with a calcium chloride distribution system in poly piping. The existing floor systems in the ice arena and curling club should be removed along with about 18" of sub grade. A new sub base with heating pipes should be installed under 3" of insulation and a new concrete floor with poly piping for the finished surface. The heating pipe under the insulation would be heated with the heat rejected from the cooling plant. This heat will keep frost from forming under the slab and keep it from moving. The new heating piping will require new heating mains, headers, and under insulation pipes. New mains for the cooling systems would be installed.

Project Rationale

The current ice plant is from 1976 and has exceeded its useful life. The plant is undersized because it was originally designed only to serve the ice arena. The ice arena floor has a plastic pipe system that has some leaking as brown spots have been noticed in the floor. The current floor does not have insulation under the floor so it creates floor movement from the frost. The current lines that run to the curling club (located in a separate building) were installed in about 1980 and have exceeded their useful life. The dehumidification system is not functioning properly - this is needed to dry the rink air. Excess moisture in indoor air will cause corrosion of metal structures, rotting of wooden structures, fungi and mold growth, increased energy consumption and ice quality problems. Safety concerns are also an issue when dripping water freezes on the rink. The heating system is needed to maintain comfortable thermal conditions for both the players and the audience. Heating is also beneficial in controlling the humidity of the ice rink in order to avoid fog and ceiling dripping problems. Moreover heat is needed for hot water production (ice resurfacing, showers) and in some cases for melting waste-ice that is the consequence of the ice resurfacing process.

Project Timeline

The project would need to be completed during the summer months.

Issue RFP - October, 2019

Sealed Bids Due/Bid Opening - November, 2019

Award/Notice to Proceed - December, 2019

Construction Phase - June, 2020 - October, 2020

Substantial Completion - October, 2020

Other Considerations

The Chisholm ice arena and curling club are unique in that one ice plant feeds both buildings. The new system will create separation between the ice arena and curling club so the operation of one isn't dependent on the other. The current system is very energy intrusive. Cost savings mean more dollars for other city services, more money to put back into the building, and more staff time available to ensure a top quality ice arena. Chisholm is the home to 2018 USA Olympic Gold Medal Curling Skip, John Shuster. Due to John Shuster's accomplishments the arena/curling club has been getting a lot of attention lately (including both nationally and internationally) and we expect this trend to continue. This project is a great opportunity to promote culture and tourism, and stimulate economic development.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There should be no additional state operating dollars requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will operate the facility?

The Curling Club has a lease agreement with the City to operate both facilities.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The main tenants for the ice arena are youth hockey and two figure skating clubs. Youth hockey has about 270 participants from Chisholm, Hibbing and the surrounding communities. This past season there were 9 youth hockey tournaments at the ice arena and the fall and spring Skills program brought in upwards of 300 youth hockey players for the two 5 week programs. The figure skating clubs have 165 participants and hold 2 skating shows each year. Between youth hockey and figure skating thousands of people visit our community each year. The ice arena also has 4 adult hockey leagues with about 110 people participating. The arena and curling club are both open 7 days a week. The ice arena operates between September and May whereas the curling club is open from November to April. The curling club has approximately 145 registered curlers. The curling club hosts 4 to 5 bonspiels per year with the largest being the Serrano Junior Bonspiel, which is probably the largest youth bonspiel in the state if not the country. The ice arena lobby is the election polling place for the City of Chisholm and the curling club is used in the summer for the youth program.

Public Purpose

The ice arena and curling club are multi-functional non-discriminatory public facilities that serve citizens of the region/state. The ice arena features seating for 1250 spectators. This allows for a variety of events/activities to be held indoors.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

William (Bill) Manney
Clerk-Treasurer/Administrator
218-254-7902
bmanney@ci.chisholm.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ice Arena and Curling Club

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,612 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,612 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,470 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$142 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,612 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Mississippi Riverfront Development | 1 | GO | 2,850 | 0 | 0 | 2,850 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,850 | 0 | 0 | 2,850 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,850 | 0 | 0 | 2,850 | 0 | 0 |

Mississippi Riverfront Development**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$2,850**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$2.85 million in state funds is requested to predesign, design, and construct the infrastructure for a multi-use riverfront development. The project will be located on the Mississippi River in Cohasset and will substantially expand and enhance the growing community's downtown core.**Project Description**

The Mississippi Riverfront Development represents a unique opportunity to build on existing strengths in Cohasset and Itasca County by developing a waterfront destination that will help drive the overall health and prosperity of the region.

Located within Cohasset's downtown core, the identified location for the development is a 30-acre parcel located south of Highway 2 and directly on the shore of the Mississippi River. Cohasset purchased the property in March 2019 from Cohasset Mill and Lumber at a total cost of \$540,000. The purchase represented a strategic move on the city's part to increase the availability of desirable land within its downtown core.

Under the proposed riverfront development project, Cohasset plans to demolish the existing buildings on the property, conduct site prep work, and construct a road, utilities, commons/green space, and 50-slip marina. Cohasset will sell off smaller parcels of the land to private developers who will construct and manage multi-use buildings to include retail/dining opportunities, a 75-room hotel, and approximately 25 1- and 2-bedroom condominiums. Cohasset has already had conversations with two developers who have experience with similar types of development projects. Both expressed a high degree of interest in the project.

The total cost for the proposed project is \$6,321,000. Cohasset has already committed \$540,000 of this cost by purchasing the needed land. The city will contribute an additional \$2,931,000 to conduct the necessary demolition, site prep, and construction of the road, utilities, commons/green space, and marina. The community requests \$2,850,000 from the state of Minnesota to help facilitate this work, which will have a long-lasting and positive impact on Cohasset, nearby Grand Rapids, and Itasca County as a whole.

Project Rationale

Cohasset is a growing community and offers many attributes to its residents, businesses, and visitors. These include a downtown core that is integrated with the Mississippi River; a growing tax base of industrial and commercial properties; in-town, rural, and shoreland residential areas; convenient access to U.S. Highway 2; clean rivers, lakes, and natural areas; and an extensive trail, park, and beach system.

Because of its many lakes and proximity to the larger and nearby community of Grand Rapids, Cohasset is growing rapidly. From 1990 to 2000, it increased by 26 percent. From 2000 to 2012, it

Additionally, Cohasset named a number of policy areas in its comprehensive plan including the Downtown/Urban area. Within this area, the city named a number of policies that are relevant to the proposed project. These include:

- Utilize the Mississippi River to establish a distinct community image and to connect Cohasset neighborhoods to each other and Cohasset to Grand Rapids. Develop a riverwalk trail system connected to a new marina with parking and enhanced recreational facilities.
- Retain key institutions and community functions in the downtown area to economically anchor the downtown, grow Cohasset's small town image, and encourage interaction by regularly bringing residents to a central place.
- Encourage development of a diverse mix of businesses and services in the downtown commercial area such as a new senior center, clinic or urgent care, grocery store, and additional restaurants or gathering places that help create a sense of place.
- Promote the core commercial area as a place for business expansion and new business formation. The river frontage from the county road 62 bridge to the Cohasset Mill and Lumber property should be developed with commercial, gathering place businesses, public river access, recreational assets, and other development that emphasizes the river.
- Enhance Cohasset's urban area by encouraging apartments or townhome development in appropriate locations adjacent to or mixed with the commercial district.
- Ensure that new development and redevelopment incorporates and connects green space particularly in the shoreland areas of the downtown/urban area.
- Expand urban services and amenities in the downtown/urban area including school facilities, playground areas in residential sections, sidewalks, and a trail connection to the riverwalk trail system and nearby trail systems.

Beyond the alignment of its comprehensive plan with the proposed project, Cohasset's city council and administrative leadership feel it's critical to implement the proposed project for a number of reasons.

- The project will complement and build on other recent community developments including expansion of the nearby industrial park, the active remodeling and construction of Cohasset's elementary school, the active construction of a childcare and senior center, and the nearby construction of approximately 25 miles of mountain bike trails.
- The riverfront development will be highly unique in the region because it will combine an outstanding sense of place with diverse and high-quality opportunities.
- The development will substantially improve Cohasset's connection with the Mississippi River.
- The development will be well located and connected to serve a regional population and tourist destination.
- The development will be readily accessible by both bikers and snowmobilers through a combination of local, regional, and state trails from nearby facilities, neighborhoods, and communities.
- The project will address regional shortages in housing and overnight lodging.
- The project will address the need for a new and high-quality destination in a growing regional center. In recent years, Cohasset, Grand Rapids, and surrounding townships have been fortunate to see many young families move to the area. These include adults in their 20s, 30s, and 40s who grew up here and desired to return. They also include residents who have moved to the area for the first time and have found jobs in local healthcare, government, schools, and business. These new residents, as well as other long-standing residents and visitors, seek contemporary forms of leisure activity, recreation, and shopping and dining opportunities.

As a whole, Cohasset needs to take action not only to increase the appeal of its downtown core, but to establish a stronger sense of identity. Currently, the community's downtown includes multiple businesses and service providers but lacks cohesiveness. Without any unifying elements such as a historic main street, it lacks the anchor qualities that give other small towns their small-town charm.

The riverfront development will act as an anchoring element within Cohasset while substantially improving the community's connection to the river and increasing its overall appeal. This will help Cohasset attract new residents, visitors, and businesses, diversifying its local economy, growing its tax base, and securing its position as a rising community that offers a diverse mix of opportunities and a high quality of life.

increased by 9 percent, outpacing Itasca County as a whole by more than 6 percent. Currently, the city's population stands at 2,800. According to the Minnesota State Demographer's office, the population will grow by 25.5 percent by 2035.

In early 2013, Cohasset completed an update to its comprehensive plan. This plan states that the city's overall community goal is to protect public waters; retain retail, rural, and shoreland neighborhoods; increase Cohasset's economic base; and grow Cohasset's small-town image.

Cohasset also defines a number of central aspirations in the comprehensive plan. Three of those most directly related to the proposed project include:

- A defined and vibrant small town core integrated with the Mississippi River.
- A growing tax base of industrial and commercial properties.
- A cohesive community where rural, downtown, and shoreland residents are active in the community and contribute to the common good.

Project Timeline

| | |
|------------------------|----------------|
| Pre-design complete | June 2020 |
| Final design completed | July 2020 |
| Construction to begin | September 2020 |
| Construction completed | September 2021 |

There are no other projects with which this project must be coordinated.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Annual operating costs of the marina, communal/green space, and related infrastructure are preliminarily estimated at \$125,000 per year over the next six years. This includes city staff time to maintain and operate the facilities as well as vehicle, equipment, and supply costs.

Who will own the facility?

The marina, commons/green area, road, and infrastructure will be owned by the city of Cohasset. The subsequent retail/dining establishments, hotel, and housing units will be privately owned.

Who will operate the facility?

The marina, commons/green area, road, and infrastructure will be maintained and operated by the city of Cohasset. The retail/dining, hotel, and housing units will be maintained and operated by private developers/owners.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Mississippi Riverfront Development will contain several distinct areas including a marina, commons/green area, retail/dining, hotel, and housing. Each area will serve its own user group.

The marina will serve people arriving by boat. These will include year-round or seasonal property owners from the stretch of the Mississippi River from Grand Rapids to Schoolcraft State Park. Within this area, the river flows through major lakes including Pokegama, Jay Gould, and Little Jay Gould. The marina will also serve day users including fishermen, canoers, kayakers, and tourists. It will provide fuel and basic supplies for purchase as well as short- and long-term slip rentals.

The commons/green area will be used by people arriving by boat, trail, or vehicle. It will include public restrooms, a splash pad, seating and picnic tables, public art, and a fire ring. The retail/dining space will also be used by people arriving by boat, trail, or vehicle.

A mix of restaurants/bars will help attract a variety of people for casual local dining and entertainment. Retail options will expand the availability of daily goods and services within Cohasset and will help solidify the development's appeal as a regional destination.

The hotel (approximately 75 rooms) will help address the shortage of lodging options in the Cohasset and Grand Rapids areas. It will be used to provide accommodations for families attending junior and high school games and tournaments and for professionals on business. It will also include space to host meetings and conferences.

The housing will include approximately 25 1- and 2-bedroom condominium units that will be available through both lease and purchase options. The primary users will be single adults, small families, and retirees.

Public Purpose

The Mississippi Riverfront Development will build on existing strengths in the community of Cohasset by establishing a high-quality downtown core and creating a unique destination that can be accessed by boat, trail, or vehicle. It will be multi-use in nature and will foster new economic development and tourism within Cohasset, nearby Grand Rapids, and Itasca County. The area is a tourism destination and regional hub for shopping and services, however, further diversification of recreational, dining, shopping, and residential options is needed to expand opportunities for visitors, residents, and businesses.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Max Peters
Director of City Operations and Finance Manager
218-328-6225
maxp@cohasset-mn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.85 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Mississippi Riverfront Development

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,850 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$540 | \$2,931 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$540 | \$5,781 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$540 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$850 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$481 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$540 | \$5,781 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Fruit Farm Road | 1 | GO | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Fruit Farm Road

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$400 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | Resurfacing of Fruit Farm Road (2.4 miles) from County Road 50 to County Road 159. |

Project Description

West 9,000 feet:

One inch milling of existing bituminous, then two inches of new bituminous overlay.

East 3,700 feet:

Milling and removal of existing bituminous, then a new 2 inch bituminous overlay (base course) plus and additional new 2 inch bituminous overlay (wear course).

Project Rationale

Due to the sealcoating process used in 2011, similar to road issues experienced on State Highways in 2011, the top layer of pavement has deteriorated and started peeling apart in several areas of the road. This greatly affects the drivability and safety of the road.

Project Timeline

Because of budget shortfalls, summer of 2020.

Other Considerations

Collegeville Township has two future major road projects, totaling 2.8 miles, with similar issues that will need to be completed by 2022. Assistance in funding of Fruit Farm Road, which has more of a public impact, will allow the Township to move forward with additional road projects and not significantly increase the annual levy.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Who will operate the facility?

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Purpose

Road is used by 26 property owners along the road. This does not include any of the businesses or student housing along the road. Road is used to access St. John's University from the west via County Road 50. Road is used by members for St. John's the Baptist Parish. Entire road is used on an annual basis for the Tour of Saints bike tour done each July. This bike tour consists of 1,100 riders each year.

This is a popular and scenic road used by the public year round and especially in fall when people visit the St. John's campus.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Terry Stein
Supervisor Chairperson
320-333-9033
tstein@mbfc.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Fruit Farm Road

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$26 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$426 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$5 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$421 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$426 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | No |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Coon Creek Regional Trail and Pedestrian Bridge | 1 | GO | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 |

Coon Creek Regional Trail and Pedestrian Bridge

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,250 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$2.250 million in state funds is requested to design and construct a new trail, pedestrian bridge along with associated lighting and streetscaping improvements for the Coon Creek Regional Trail over County State Aid Highway 1 (Coon Rapids Boulevard) approximately 400' northwest of the intersection of Avocet Street and Coon Rapids Boulevard in Coon Rapids. |

Project Description

The project will involve the construction of a trail (\$300,000); a pedestrian bridge spanning Coon Rapids Boulevard (\$4,000,000); pedestrian-scale lighting (\$100,000); and related streetscaping improvements (\$100,000) for a total projected price of \$4,500,000. The City of Coon Rapids is seeking \$2,250,000 in state funds and would contribute the remaining funds from local sources, including the City's pooled tax increment program that is available for public infrastructure. The project would be built within existing road right-of-way and would not require any additional land acquisitions.

Project Rationale

The project provides a grade separation for Coon Creek Regional Trail over Coon Rapids Boulevard, which is a 4 lane divided county state aid highway that carries 29,000 vehicles per day. In addition, the project will help facilitate safe and continuous trips to regional destinations and eliminate pedestrian and cyclist exposure to vehicle traffic on Coon Rapids Boulevard.

Project Timeline

- Pre-Design Work: January – February 2021
- Public Engagement: March - April 2021
- Design (Engineering) Work: May – July 2021
- Advertising & Public Bidding: August – September 2021
- Bid Award: October 2021
- Utilities & Site Preparation: November 2021
- Construction (Start): May 2022
- Construction (Completed): November 2022

Other Considerations

This project also serves to benefit the immediately adjacent communities. According to U.S. Census data, the census tract encompassing the proposed bridge has a far higher rate of residents below the poverty line (25.7%) than surrounding tracts (averaging 8.9%). The surrounding neighborhoods contain a number of multi-family housing developments, as well as the alternative Anoka Hennepin

Regional High School. The school serves as a community resource, offering night classes for all ages and other adult educational opportunities. The bridge will make it easier for residents of any age to reach these and other resources, such as existing transit stops for residents to reach employment in downtown Minneapolis. Creating a safe connection between these locations opens up the adjacent community to greater economic and social mobility.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Not applicable

Who will own the facility?

City of Coon Rapids

Who will operate the facility?

City of Coon Rapids

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The trail and pedestrian bridge will be used by the general public, including pedestrians and bicyclists.

Public Purpose

Construction of the trail and pedestrian bridge will improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and do so in a safe manner. Coon Rapids Boulevard is a high traffic volume roadway that is a barrier to pedestrian and bicycle connections on the Coon Creek Regional Trail. A traffic signal exists at Avocet Street, where the Coon Creek Regional Trail intersects with Coon Rapids Boulevard that allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross Coon Rapids Boulevard. However, comments received during public engagement revealed a perception that the pedestrian crossing is difficult and a barrier to pedestrian use, particularly for children and senior citizens that may have a slower walking pace. The Coon Creek Regional Trail bridge also improves the connection to the Mississippi River Regional Trail, which is less than a mile south of Coon Rapids Boulevard and provides access for Coon Rapids residents to other regional, state and national trails

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Grant Fernelius
Community Development Director
763-767-6451
gfernelius@coonrapidsmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.25 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Coon Creek Regional Trail and Pedestrian Bridge

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Sanitary Sewer System Rehabilitation | 1 | GO | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Sanitary Sewer System Rehabilitation

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$3,500**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The City of Cottonwood needs to rehabilitate or replace large portions of their sanitary sewer system, including the main lift station. Nearly 45% of the system has been rated in poor or very poor condition based on a 2011 televising report. It is estimated that these conditions now exceed 50% of the system. The City intends to initiate a project to repair these areas over the next one to two years, either by utilizing cast in place lining or by excavating and replacing the main lines.

Project Description

The project will replace the main lift station followed by repair/rehabilitation of the city's sanitary sewer mains based on the condition assessment spreadsheet derived from the 2011 televising report on file with the City. The project will address the sanitary sewer main segments categorized into the red, orange, and yellow categories within the spreadsheet, with the red (very poor) segments receiving the highest priority. Some segments will be excavated and physically replaced due to their extremely poor condition and not being able to adequately accept a cast in place liner. Remaining segments will be rehabilitated in place by means of a cast in place liner.

Project Rationale

The wastewater collection system is a vital piece of infrastructure to the functionality of the City. When the wastewater main lines begin to deteriorate and the system fails to work properly, the financial well-being and public health of the City are hindered. The City of Cottonwood has close to 34,000 lineal feet of wastewater main lines that, unfortunately, have been neglected for several decades. The main lines are in poor to very poor condition with significant fractures, deterioration, and soil exposure that has resulted in severe inflow and infiltration. This inflow and infiltration issues have led to high flows through the City's main lift station during large rain events, spring snow melt, and/or rapid ground thawing. Combined with the age of the main lift station, the high flow levels have led to the lift station being unstable and in very poor condition, an emergency that the City must act on now by constructing a new main lift station. As a community with a population of 1,300, Cottonwood's wastewater collection ponds are designed to hold a maximum of 160,000 gallons per day or 4.8 million gallons a month. In the month of April, the main lift station recorded 16.2 million gallons of flow, three times the amount the wastewater collection ponds were designed to hold. These extreme flows from inflow and infiltration pose a problem during periods that pond discharging is not authorized, and they have led to the City receiving a New Water Quality Based Effluent Limit notification from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency that requires the City to meet certain phosphorus limits within a year. In order to receive the new General Pond Permit from MPCA, the phosphorus levels must get under control. After consulting with the chemical company, Hawkins, on an Alum treatment for the ponds, it was discovered that the only time phosphorus limits are exceeded are when there are severe flows into the wastewater collection ponds. For the City, this means that the only treatment option that we have is to address the inflow and infiltration issues within the wastewater main lines.

Project Timeline

The City intends to begin repairs to the sanitary sewer system early in 2020. Depending on funding and resource availability, the City hops to complete the project by the fall of 2021.

Other Considerations

A City of approximately 1,300 people lacks the resources internally to complete a project of this magnitude. Having learned from the past, the City intends to set up a recurring inspection and maintenance plan to continually assess the condition of the sanitary sewer system and make repairs on a much smaller level as they arise, which is much more affordable for a city the size of Cottonwood. In order to get to that state, however, resources are needed to make repairs and replacements to get the system into a condition where a recurring maintenance and repair program will be effective.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Local government entity, City of Cottonwood.

Who will operate the facility?

Local government entity, City of Cottonwood.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Local government entity, City of Cottonwood.

Public Purpose

The sanitary sewer system is a public health issue for the entire town. If a component of the system fails (i.e. main collapse, lift station failure, etc.), raw sewage can back up into residences, and businesses creating a public health hazard for the city's population

Description of Previous Appropriations

NONE

Project Contact Person

Teather Bliss
507-423-6488
teather@cityofcottonwoodmn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Sanitary Sewer System Rehabilitation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,750 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$28 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,823 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$249 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,750 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | No |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Voyageurs National Park Visitor Center | 1 | GO | 6,600 | 0 | 0 | 6,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,600 | 0 | 0 | 6,600 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,600 | 0 | 0 | 6,600 | 0 | 0 |

Voyageurs National Park Visitor Center

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$6,600

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The Town of Crane Lake is requesting \$6,600,000 in state funds for the construction of a Visitor Center, Campground, A DNR boat ramp and an access road from the Visitor Center to the boat ramp to accommodate activities for the Voyageur National Park, the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area along the shores of Crane Lake.

Project Description

The Township of Crane Lake will be constructing a 7,000 square foot Visitor Center (Including site preparation) that will include a visitor entrance area, theater, meeting room, gift shop, restrooms with showers, will include exhibit space for native wildlife and staff office. The campground will include RV sites, tent sites, restrooms, parking for cars and boats, site utilities and shower facilities. The project also includes the construction of a DNR boat ramp and the purchase of land to construct an access road between the Visitor Center and the boat ramp. Total estimated cost for the visitor center is \$6,200,000 the campground is \$1,200,000, the boat ramp/access road is \$1,200,000.

Voyageurs National Park is Minnesota’s only national park and the nation’s only water-based national park, consisting of more than 84,000 acres of water and 134,000 acres of land. The interconnected waterways of the park provide an unparalleled opportunity for citizens to explore the Northwood’s lake and border country. You must leave your car and take to the water to fully explore and experience the lakes, islands, and shorelines of the park. Nearly 200 years ago, voyageurs paddled birch bark canoes full of animal pelts and trade goods through the park on their way to Canada. Today, people explore the park by canoes, kayaks, houseboats, and motorboats.

There are currently four access points to the Park and are located at Rainy Lake Visitor Center, Kabetogama Visitor Center, Ash River Visitor Center and Crane Lake. At each of these entrance points, a variety of guest services are available, including lodging, resorts, provisions, fuel, etc., provided primarily by the private sector. However, in three of the entrance points, a quality Park Service visitor center exists, enhancing the entrance point to the Park, providing safety and instruction, boat ramps and access, and educational displays and programs. The only entrance point without a Park presence is the gateway site at Crane Lake.

Project Rationale

When the Park was developed decades ago, the community of Crane Lake was promised a Visitor Center. It is time to fulfill that vision and promise in order to enhance the guest experience of users of the Park and to provide the community of Crane Lake with a quality Park presence.

The Township has been working very closely, and has the support of, the Minnesota DNR, the Superior National Park, the US Forest Service and the National Park. Through the cooperation and assistance from these entities, the Township updated their Community Plan in 4/16 to include this project.

The project will be located on the former Borderland Resort site in Crane Lake. The Township was successful in securing a \$950, 000 grant from the LCCMR to acquire this property.

The completion of this project will create a significant number of new full-time employment opportunities and will help to bolster the local tourism based economy.

Project Timeline

Design Completed - December 2020
Project Bid - February 2021
Construction Start - June 2021
Project Completed - December 2023

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Crane Lake Township and its partners will be responsible for all annual operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

Crane Lake Township will own.

Who will operate the facility?

Crane Lake will operate.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Voyageur Park and Township will occupy.

Public Purpose

Project provides access to a variety of publicly owned outdoor activities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jim Janssen
Board Chair
218-993-1303
info@craquelaketwp.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$6.6 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Voyageurs National Park Visitor Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$7,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| City of Crystal Police Department Expansion | 1 | GO | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 |

City of Crystal Police Department Expansion

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$4,000**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: \$4 million in state funds is requested for final design and construction of a new, larger police department as part of the City Hall campus complex for the City of Crystal in Hennepin County. The City Hall building was originally constructed in 1965, with significant updating and remodeling in 1993, but now the Police Department space is outdated, inefficient and doesn't meet State code requirements.

Project Description

The Crystal Police Department currently occupies 17,210 square feet of Crystal City Hall. In 2017, the city hired Wold Architects to conduct a space needs analysis for the Police Department. Wold determined the Police Department ideally needs 38,046 square feet, more than double the space the Police currently have. The additional space includes approximately 10,000 square feet of secure indoor parking for the Police Department fleet. There are currently multiple evidence storage areas, which presents serious chain of custody concerns. The locker rooms are beyond capacity and several officers no longer use the locker room and use their office to make space in the locker room for other officers. The holding cells, which are 16-hour holding cells, no longer meet Code requirements for "guest" and police staff safety. The armory is a makeshift space created from a former storage closet at the end of a hall. There is sufficient space on the current City Hall site to construct a new department which would ultimately be connected to the city's administrative offices and a part of the City Hall campus.

Preliminary cost estimates for this project are \$10.5 million in 2019 dollars. The project is included in the city's long term capital plan as beginning construction in 2021. We anticipate the project will be completed over 2021 – 2022. The city has at least \$4 million in cash on hand towards the project and the long term capital plan currently includes a preliminary placeholder of the City issuing up to \$8 million in general obligation bonds to fund the balance of the project.

Project Rationale

The City Hall building was originally constructed in 1965, with significant updating and remodeling in 1993. However, the Police Department space (currently 17,210 square feet) is outdated, inefficient and doesn't meet State code requirements. A space needs analysis done for the Police Department in 2017 determined the Police Department ideally needs 38,046 square feet, more than double the space the Police currently have. The additional space includes approximately 10,000 square feet of secure indoor parking for the Police Department fleet. There are currently multiple evidence storage areas, which presents serious chain of custody concerns. The locker rooms are beyond capacity and several officers no longer use the locker room and use their office to make space in the locker room for other officers. The holding cells, which are 16-hour holding cells, no longer meet Code requirements for those in custody and police staff safety. The armory is less than ideal as it is a makeshift space created from a former storage closet at the end of a hall. In order to efficiently and

safely serve the residents and businesses of Crystal, a new Crystal Police Department space is necessary.

Project Timeline

2017 – Predesign started

2018 – Reviewed and refined preliminary design and cost estimates based on staff and elected officials input

July – December 2019 – determine specific project timing, costs and sources of project funding

2020 – finalize project design

January 2021 – solicit bids

Summer 2021 – construction starts

Late fall 2022 – construction complete

Other Considerations

The Crystal Police Department partners formally and informally with neighboring law enforcement agencies in providing public safety to the community. The Crystal Police partners through joint powers agreement for the Northwest Drug Task Force and Northwest SWAT team. Informally, the Crystal Police provide mutual aid and assistance on a routine and regular basis to our neighbors. Crystal Police contracts with Cornerstone for domestic violence advocacy and prevention and a Cornerstone staff advocate offices and is embedded in the Crystal Police department. Crystal is a member of Hennepin County’s Joint Community Police Project program to encourage inclusion and developing, maintaining and improving relationships between communities of color and the Police Department. The JCPP staff person assigned to Crystal offices and is embedded in the Crystal Police Department.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The new Police station will have minimal impact to the city’s operating budget over the next 6 years. With a larger space, there will be additional custodial services needed which are anticipated to be absorbed by current custodial staff and services. There will be additional demands on IT with department security and work stations. These demands are anticipated to be absorbed by current IT staff and contracted services. Additional utility costs are anticipated to be minimal and will be absorbed in the operating budget. No additional state dollars will be requested for operating costs.

Who will own the facility?

The city of Crystal will own the expanded police station facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The city of Crystal will operate the expanded police station facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Crystal Police Department will occupy all of the expanded police station facility.

Public Purpose

Crystal Police provides public safety and first responder services to the community. A new, larger Police facility will provide safe and efficient work space for the Crystal Police Department.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Anne Norris
City Manager
763-531-1140
anne.norris@crystalmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$4 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

City of Crystal Police Department Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$10 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$5,811 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$10 | \$13,811 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$10 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,228 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$1,050 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$1,833 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$10 | \$13,811 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater | 1 | GO | 625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$625 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$625K in state funds to complete the project of Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater. Project is for the City of Currie located within the City Limits of the City. |

Project Description

The title of this project as described by USDA Rural Development is City of Currie-Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater. The project has been reviewed by MPCA, MDH, DNR and has been on the need to update for several years. Several legislative attempts have been made to be included in previous bonding bills and while included a couple of times, nothing happened. We were fortunate to be ranked high enough through the Clean Water Revolving Fund and MPCA Project Priority List and a cooperative effort by USDA/RD and the Public Facilities Authority to provide funding so we could move ahead with the project.

Need for the Project requires 6700 feet of sewer pipe replacement, which is 100 years old. Storm sewer segments broken, undersized and in some cases connected to sanitary sewer locations which increased flows by 400% with a 2-inch rainfall. More than 50% of the water system is 4-inch diameter or smaller cast iron pipe. Many residences served by 3/4-inch pipe. Over three miles of new water pipe are included, as well as new meters to replace failing, inaccurate-reading existing ones. Distribution pipes less than 6-inch diameter not recognized as safe or adequate by current standards and fire codes. Upgrading and repainting Water Tower to include Treatment Plant improvements.

Project funding as follows: USDA/RD Grant - \$1,937 million Loan - \$1,010 million
 PFA Grant - \$2,712 million
 City of Currie - \$201K

Gap funds needed to complete the project - \$589K
 Inflation for 2019 funding - \$18K

Inflation for 2020 funding - \$18K
 Total bonding bill request- \$625K

Project Rationale

Failing infrastructure of an antiquated water and sewer system leads to life and safety issues. Continued water line breaks, under-sized piping to many of the residences and businesses. Aging water meters that do not record properly and unavailability of replacement parts. Fire hydrants that have aging and part-replacement failures. Storm water leakage into the sanitary sewer system due to a County Ditch System located within the City with no maintenance or improvements since the 1970's. MPCA and DNR have requested that many of the improvements need to be made.

Project Timeline

To minimize construction tails and operating costs, the Project is being done jointly with the Murray County Highway Department to reduce funding required. A City street is also County Highway CSAH 38 and is due for mill and overlay. The water and sewer line work within that area will only require excavation once, due to the cooperative efforts. That portion of work will be done in 2019. Contracts have been let and a two-year window of construction will start mid-June of 2019. The project has been completely designed by SEH and approved by USDA/RD and Minnesota Public Facilities Authority.

Other Considerations

Currie, MN is located near Lake Shetek in Murray County, Minnesota and the Headwaters of the Des Moines River, which outlets to the Mississippi River near Keokuk, Iowa. We are attempting to do our part to help clean up our rivers, while improving safety and security for the residents of Currie. Project Ranking by MPCA – 2018 Clean Water Project Priority List (PPL) – Rank of 39. City of Currie's (population 223) Capital Bonding Request of \$625K is to aid in coverage of Non-eligible construction costs.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

One-time request for bonding dollars in the year 2020 to cover funding gap incurred in the Project. The City of Currie will be responsible for annual operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

City of Currie, MN

Who will operate the facility?

Currie Public Works Staff

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City, Businesses and Residents of Currie, MN

Public Purpose

Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Lynn Nicks
City Clerk/Treasurer
507-763-1540
currie@iw.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Infrastructure Improvements Water, Wastewater and Storm Wastewater

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$625 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$2,712 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$2,947 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$201 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,485 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$18 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$884 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$17 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,566 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,485 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Public Safety and Greenway Improvements | 1 | GO | 22,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regional Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Recycling Facility | 2 | GO | 10,440 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veterans Memorial Greenway | 3 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 38,190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 38,190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Public Safety and Greenway Improvements

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$22,750**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** Dakota County requests \$22.75M in state funds for costs associated with the acquisition, predesign, design, engineering, and construction of regional greenway improvements. The projects will help protect greenway users and commuters by addressing critical trail gaps and constructing crossings to enhance public safety.**Project Description**

The project will include the implementation of up to 15 sub-projects in the River to River Greenway, Mendota to Lebanon Hills Greenway, Mississippi River Regional Trail, Minnesota River Greenway, Lake Marion Greenway, and North Creek Greenway, adding as many as 10 miles of multiuse accessible trail and safe road crossings. The total estimated cost of the projects is approximately \$50M, with approximately \$34.7M derived from locally-secured funds and approximately \$4.5M coming from other state revenues.

Project Rationale

Dakota County is home to 425,000 people, eight percent of the state population, and popular destinations and attractions that draw thousands of visitors each year. In 2017, the County greenway system saw 537,000 visitors according to the Metropolitan Council. With more walkers and cyclists comes more risk. There are ten miles of critical trail gaps in the greenway system and ten dangerous crossings that place over half a million walkers and cyclists at risk of harm. State funding will help to protect greenway users and commuters by addressing these critical trail gaps and constructing crossings to enhance safety.

Project Timeline

The 15 sub-projects are in different stages of acquisition, planning and design. To the extent possible, sub-projects will be coordinated with each other and possibly combined with other projects to achieve efficiencies in delivery. It is anticipated that all sub-projects will be completed within a four-year time frame.

Other Considerations

The request was introduced as part of the ML19 State Bonding. Dakota County is committed to its vision creating a 200-mile system of trails connecting regional, state and local parks, schools, libraries and communities. Thus far, Dakota County has invested over \$65 million of non-State resources towards this vision. Dakota County is proud of having completed over 35 miles of this system to date. The request we have submitted, if approved, will fill gaps in the system while addressing priority public safety concerns.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The greenway improvements will increase operational and maintenance costs, but the County does not expect to request any new or additional State funding for operating costs outside of revenues already received.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Greenway improvements will be used by the general public.

Public Purpose

Greenway improvements will be used for recreation and commuting by the general public. The improvements are part of the Metropolitan Parks Regional Park and Greenway System and consistent with master plans approved by the Metropolitan Council and the Dakota County Board of Commissioners.

Description of Previous Appropriations

- River to River Greenway, pending \$2,200,000 State Bonding grant to the City of West Saint Paul

Project Contact Person

Erin Stwora
Deputy Director, Physical Development Division
952-891-7000
Erin.Stwora@co.dakota.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Public Safety and Greenway Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$22,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$4,525 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,940 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,221 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$12,655 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$50,091 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$5,009 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$1,252 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$8,766 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$35,064 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$50,091 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Regional Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Recycling Facility

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$10,440**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** Dakota County requests \$10.44 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, predesign, design, construct, and equip a new regional household hazardous waste collection and recycling facility.**Project Description**

Dakota County and Scott County are negotiating a partnership on a regional household hazardous waste and recycling facility to help keep hazardous waste and recyclables out of landfills and the environment.

The facility will be used to collect and properly manage household hazardous waste (e.g. electronics, paint, pesticides, batteries, fluorescent), recyclables (e.g., cans, plastic, paper, cardboard, scrap metal), and problem materials (e.g., tires, appliance, organics).

The facility will be approximately 24,000 square feet on at least an eight-acre site which will allow for sufficient space for access drives, car and truck traffic, parking lots, and outdoor storage. The projected cost for the facility is \$11.6 million. The primary funding source for this project would be state bonding dollars, with matching County funds from money received through negotiated host fee agreements with the landfills located in Dakota County.

Project Rationale

Dakota County's and Scott County's existing household hazardous waste and recycling centers are insufficient to meet current and future needs. The two facilities properly manage almost seven million pounds of material per year from over 80,000 participants. Dakota County's facility already handles four times the capacity it was designed to accommodate, and Scott County's program growth is projected to be 325 percent by 2030. In addition, the large geographical area of Scott County and Dakota County results in underserved areas. In a recent survey, 25% of Dakota County residents that did not use the facility said it was either too far away or inconvenient.

A regional facility located in the Burnsville/Lakeville geographic area would increase participation by 32 percent by offering additional convenient opportunities to properly manage hazardous waste and recyclables. An additional site serving both counties also will prolong the life of the two existing facilities by slowing the growth at those sites.

This project will provide convenient and cost-effective drop-off locations for problem materials, household hazardous waste, and recyclables from residents and businesses from both Dakota County and Scott County. In addition, materials from residents living in the other five Twin Cities-area counties will be collected at the site through reciprocal use agreements with those counties. Problem materials, such as tires, appliances, pharmaceutical wastes, and hard-to-recycle items may also be collected. A drop-site for residential organics collection is also being considered.

Project Timeline

Q1 2019: Incorporate bonding request into legislative platform and secure consultant for site selection services (Complete)
Q2 2019: Present partnership concept to Scott County Board of Commissioners (Complete)
Q3 2019: Identify potential site location
Q4 2019: Finalize Cooperative Agreement with Scott County Board and Dakota County Board to secure preferred site
Q1 2020: Design team selection and approval by the Board, then begin schematic design
Q2 2020: Complete schematic design and seek approval from the Dakota County Board of Commissioners; start design development
Q3 2020: Complete design development and start construction documents
Q4 2020: Complete construction documents and bid the project
Q1 2021: Obtain County Board approval of construction General Contractor at January meeting; contract award.
Q2 2021: Mobilize on-site and active construction, nine months +/-
Jan 2022: Open facility for use

Other Considerations

The facility's primary use will be for the collection and proper management of household hazardous waste, recyclables, and problem materials. A secondary use will include environmental education.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There will be no impact on State operating subsidies. Dakota County is requesting bonding for the construction of the facility. Operating costs will be covered by user fees and Dakota County and Scott County.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County staff or a consultant for the County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Dakota County staff and/or consultant staff

Public Purpose

M.S. 473.804 requires each metropolitan county to implement a permanent program to manage household hazardous waste and M.S. 115A.552 requires counties to make at least one recycling center available within the county. The proposed facility will assist Dakota and Scott Counties in meeting this mandate by providing convenient opportunities for residents of Dakota County and Scott County to dispose of household hazardous waste and recyclables, ensuring the proper disposal of these items and protecting the environment and public health from the impacts of improper disposal and contamination.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There are no previous state appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Erin Stwora
Deputy Director, Physical Development Division
952-891-7000
erin.stwora@co.dakota.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Regional Household Hazardous Waste Collection and Recycling Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,440 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,160 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$87 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$783 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$85 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$6,743 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$10 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$1,892 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Veterans Memorial Greenway**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$5,000**Priority Ranking:** 3**Project Summary:** Dakota County requests \$5 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, predesign, design and construct a five-mile regional greenway trail stretching between Lebanon Hills Regional Park and the Mississippi River in Dakota County.**Project Description**

The Veterans Memorial Greenway is a new five-mile greenway that would include five to seven veteran memorials along the route. At least one of the memorials could accommodate large group gatherings. The project includes a 10 foot wide asphalt trail that would be built to Americans with Disabilities Act standards, accommodating people of all abilities. The trail would be open to the public for the purpose of walking, jogging, and bicycling. The greenway trail corridor would be park-like, connecting open spaces and providing an enjoyable experience in nature. Several neighborhood access points would be located along the route, providing easy access to the trail and the memorials. The greenway trail would connect to existing trails on each end, as part of Dakota County's 200-mile-long planned greenway system.

The memorials along the trail will be planned and constructed in partnership with veterans groups.

Dakota County has adopted a master plan for the greenway trail and is in the process of assembling right of way, and completing a construction feasibility study.

The total cost of the project is \$10 million. Dakota County would match the \$5 million bonding request with the following sources of funding:

- Metropolitan Council Park and Open Space Funding
- Dakota County
- Corporate sponsorships
- Veterans groups
- Grants

Dakota County and the Regional Park System will incur the annual operating costs of operating the facility. Annual operating costs are estimated to be \$25,000 for maintenance, natural resource management, and security.

Project Rationale

Dakota County does not have a regional facility to recognize the service of its veterans. There are 25,000 veterans who have served in the armed forces from the 34 cities and townships in Dakota County.

Project Timeline

Upon securing funding, Dakota County would begin final design of the infrastructure component of the

greenway including trail, trailheads, grade-separated road crossing and landscaping. Design and construction would occur within three to five years. Concurrently, Dakota County would begin working with veteran organizations on the interpretive/memorial elements along the corridor. The project would be substantially completed in five years according to the following timeline:

Acquisition - Present to July 2021

Predesign - July 2020 to December 2021

Design/Engineering - December 2021 to December 2022

Construction - April 2023 to May 2024

Other Considerations

This project will be designed in partnership with veterans groups and will include coordination with the Cities of Inver Grove Heights and Eagan.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None. Facility will be operated by Dakota County using County funds.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The general public, including veterans and their families.

Public Purpose

Honor the service of veterans, provide locations for remembrance, accommodate recreational needs, and protect nature and the environment.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous State appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Erin Stwora
Deputy Director, Physical Development Division
952-891-7000
erin.stwora@co.dakota.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Veterans Memorial Greenway

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Dassel-Cokato Regional Activity Center | 1 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |

Dassel-Cokato Regional Activity Center**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$5,000**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: \$5,000,000 is requested from the bond proceeds fund to the Commissioner of Education for a grant to Independent School District No. 466, Dassel-Cokato Public Schools, to complete the construction, furnishing and equipping of the school district's Regional Activity Center to include a walking track, field house, ice rink, gymnastics facility, community center and other items necessary for the function of the facility

Project Description

Scope: Completion of a field house/ice rink with the addition of a dedicated location for gymnastics, community center, walking track and facilities necessary for use (bathrooms, locker rooms, office space, elevator, etc.).

Total cost: \$10,664,000

Key funding sources: locally supported bond, building donation from a local non-profit group, state bond of \$5,000,000

Square footage added: 29,460 (locker rooms, community center, walking track, gymnastics facility)

Square footage remodeled: 33,750 (field house, ice rink)

Project Rationale

A facility comparable to this does not exist in the school district or in adjacent communities. Dassel-Cokato Public School is a property poor school district which makes it more difficult for taxpayers to support locally funded projects such as this. Provisions of this facility will benefit both the school district and surrounding communities. \$5,000,000 in bond support from the State of Minnesota will make passing a local bond much easier.

20 years of effort by a local non-profit makes this project unique. The Dassel-Cokato Regional Ice and Sports Center non-profit worked with donors throughout the community to raise funds resulting in a beautiful 250 feet long by 135 feet wide shell on school property that will provide the structure for the field house and ice rink. The current facility is valued at \$1,500,000.

Project Timeline

Design work is already in the beginning stages. Preliminary plans including design and budget were presented to the school board on May 13, 2019. If this bond is granted, the school district will hold a local bonding vote during the 2020-21 school year. Depending upon the timing of the local bond vote, the project could start anywhere between March 2021 to June 2021.

Other Considerations

An extreme amount of local effort has gone into the project up to this date. We simply need more

funding to continue to move forward and our property poor status makes gaining this funding difficult.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Regional Activity Center, once completed, will be 63,210 square feet of finished space. The building will have its own operating budget estimated as follows:

Who will own the facility?

Independent School District #466, Dassel-Cokato Public Schools

Who will operate the facility?

Independent School District #466, Dassel-Cokato Public Schools

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Independent School District #466 and community members from the district and surrounding communities.

Public Purpose

To provide expanded recreational opportunities to youth and adults in the Dassel-Cokato School District and surrounding communities including a dedicated space for senior citizens.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$250,000 Mighty Ducks Grant from Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission which expires December 2019

Project Contact Person

Jeff Powers
Superintendent
320-286-4103
jeff.powers@dc.k12.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Dassel-Cokato Regional Activity Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$5,174 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,664 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$575 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$165 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,538 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$386 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,664 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | No |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Sewer and Water System Improvements | 1 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Sewer and Water System Improvements

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$5,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$5,000,000 in state funds is requested to design and make improvements to the city's water and sewer systems. |

Project Description

This request is for \$5,000,000 in state funding is to make improvements/additions to the wastewater treatment plant and to replace deteriorated sewer, water, and storm mains.

The existing sewer lines are over 60 years old, are primarily clay pipe and have outlived their useful life. The City is experiencing large amounts of Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) in their municipal wastewater system. The system has reached its capacity and the city is unable to add new residents and businesses until the I/I is reduced. The City did complete an I/I Removal Plan in August of 2009.

The City's wastewater stabilization pond system is at its capacity and needs to be improved and expanded in order to serve its residents and businesses. A new pond will be constructed north of the existing secondary pond and will share a common berm. Like the existing pond cells the new cell will be designed and constructed to meet all regulatory requirements and will be sized to meet the city's current and future needs.

The existing water lines are also over 60 years old, have outlived their useful life and are repaired very frequently which is a burden on the City's annual operation and maintenance budget. The lines are in such a poor condition that the City has to operate its water system at a pressure level far less than desired. The City's water quality is just barely meeting the state's water quality standards. The city currently adds the chemicals chlorine, fluoride and phosphate C-5 to meet existing standards.

Total estimated cost for this project is \$10,000,000. The city is requesting \$5,000,000 from the state through this application and has received approval from the USDA to provide the \$5,000,000 match.

Project Rationale

This project is needed in order to meet the city's infrastructure needs. The wastewater treatment system needs to be expanded in order for the city to add a new residential dwelling or any type of business expansion. The water distribution lines are undersized and are so deteriorated that the city has to operate the system at a low pressure which makes it difficult for the city to meet its drinking water and fire protection needs. The sewer collection system is very old and deteriorated. Many of the sewer lines have cracks which cause I/I which forces the city to treat a large volume of clean water that creates undo burden on their annual operation and maintenance budget.

Project Timeline

Engineering completed 2019

Project bid December 2020

Bid Award May 2021

Construction begins June 2021

Completion December 2022

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The city will not need or seek additional state subsidies to operate and maintain the project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Deer River

Who will operate the facility?

City Staff

Who will use or occupy the facility?

NA

Public Purpose

Municipal water and Sewer Services.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Mark Box
218-246-8195
boxm0927@gmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Sewer and Water System Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Duluth Coastal Infrastructure Rehabilitation - Lakewalk and Harbor Sea Walls | 1 | GO | 13,500 | 0 | 0 | 13,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 13,500 | 0 | 0 | 13,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 13,500 | 0 | 0 | 13,500 | 0 | 0 |

Duluth Coastal Infrastructure Rehabilitation - Lakewalk and Harbor Sea Walls

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$13,500**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$13.5 million is requested for the final phase rehabilitation of Duluth's storm-damaged coastal infrastructure at two adjoining locations of the Lakewalk and Harbor sea walls. The project will restore coastal infrastructure that is the centerpiece of a nationally significant tourist destination and supports the busiest port by tonnage in the Great Lakes.**Project Description**

Aging infrastructure and wave damage from Lake Superior storms have combined to cause coastal infrastructure failures that grow worse with each new storm. Failures in the form of compromised sea walls, disintegrating coastal armoring, disappearing park and trail amenities, sink holes, and wave-pummeled infrastructure increasingly threaten public safety, recreational access, and Duluth's six-million-visitors-per-year tourism economy.

Phase I

Phase I rehabilitation work on the Lakewalk and adjoining harbor sea walls began in 2018 and will continue through 2020. Phase I included construction of 1300 feet of new sheet pile sea wall at Minnesota Slip and repair of portions of the Lakewalk damaged by a series of three state and federal storm disasters.

The attached Map I, Sea Wall Section Map, shows all of the harbor seawall infrastructure in question. Sections H, G, F, and E at Minnesota Slip were repaired in Phase I for a total of \$7.3 million. The current request is for repair of Sections A, B, C, D, and K and adjoining trail infrastructure and roadway behind the Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center (DECC).

The attached Maps II-to-VI, Lakewalk Damage Sections, show all of the Lakewalk infrastructure that needs to be reconstructed. The legend of the map indicates which Lakewalk sections are included in Phase I and which are included in the Phase II project for which we are now requesting funding.

Phase II

Area I, Harbor Sea Walls, Trail Infrastructure, and Roadway. \$8,100,00 is requested for Area I to rehabilitate the 1,200 feet of sea wall and adjoining trail infrastructure and roadway behind the DECC. This infrastructure is extremely aged and portions are in immediate danger of failing or have already failed. The sea wall, trail infrastructure, and roadway are structurally integrated such that reconstruction of one strongly recommends reconstruction of all three.

Area II, Lakewalk. \$5,400,000 is requested for the rehabilitation of the Lakewalk inclusive of shoreline armoring and trail infrastructure. Lakewalk facilities are over 30 years old and failing or not accessible. The shoreline from Canal Park to 21st Ave East is highly unstable clay that is collapsing due to the storms and wave action that is expected to continue.

Area I: Harbor Sea Walls, Trail Infrastructure, and Roadway

This portion of the project rehabilitates the remaining approximately 1,200 linear feet of sea wall infrastructure along the Duluth harbor sea wall in front of the DECC, and will complete the overall rehabilitation of the entire contiguous dock wall structure spanning from Minnesota Slip to the Great Lakes Aquarium. This is a two-phase project broken down into sections that correspond to locations and age as identified below. Please refer again to Map 1: Sea Wall Section Map which refers to rehabilitation of:

- i. Sections C and E. These are dock sea walls built in the late 1880's to the 1950's, now requiring complete replacement. These areas are showing signs of eminent failure and represent significant public safety concerns as well as access concerns as the Vista Fleet operates from section E.
- ii. Sections A, B, and D. These are dock sea walls built from the 1950's to 1980's with different types of steel sheet pile. They are significantly deteriorated due to the caustic properties of the water that accelerate corrosion, but can be salvaged by repairing, reinforcing and protecting them from further deterioration. Reconstruction of Section D is essential to plan to meet the growing demand to establish Duluth as an international destination for cruiseships.
- iii. Section K. This sea wall is debris and old pilings that remain from old dock structures and impede safe access to Minnesota Slip.
- iv. Harbor Drive. The drive services the entire DECC complex as well as the public harbor access along the sea wall and is over 60 years old. The road is undermined with voids caused by the sloughing sea wall infrastructure and suffers from continual ponding and damage after rain or storm events.

Note: the areas labeled as I and J on the map are not part of this request due to ownership uncertainty.

Area II: Lakewalk (Canal Park to 21st Ave East)

The infrastructure in this area is integral to the Lakewalk - the centerpiece of Duluth's six-million-visitors-per-year tourism economy. The Lakewalk connects the Bayfront Park areas to Canal Park, Gitchi ode' Akiing, the Rose Garden, Leif Erikson Park, downtown Duluth, and two nationally significant trail systems – US Bicycle Route 41 and the North Country Trail. Portions of this public corridor were impacted by the same storms that destroyed large sections of Canal Park and the Bayfront, and the need to improve these areas to ensure future resiliency in the face of high lake water levels and storm water action, warrants inclusion in the Lakewalk General Obligation Bond request. Activities include:

- i. Shoreline: The plan for the shoreline will vary with location but includes new stone revetment with a slope of 2:1 with stone toe protection with regrading, geotextile fabric, stone core fill, and stone armor layer that provides a stable slope for the bluff and lateral stability for the boardwalk and paved trail.
- ii. Trails: Paved trails will be 10 - 12 feet wide and will conform to recommendations contained within the 2007 "MnDOT Bikeway Facility Design Manual" developed by the Minnesota Department of Transportation.
- iii. Boardwalk: New, upgraded, wood boardwalk will replace boardwalk sections damaged by storms and bank failure with wider, better-protected versions. Other, connecting stretches that were not damaged will be upgraded to reset their lifecycle.
- iv. Signs: standard regulatory signs, wayfinding and directional signs and interpretive signs that tell the story of the lakewalk and shoreline restoration as well the science and need behind resiliency methods ranging from erosion control, habitat protection and pollinator gardens.
- v. Infrastructure: Storm water control is a hybrid of grey and green infrastructure to achieve zero runoff which will preserve slope and shoreline stability. Railings and fences and lighting will increase safety with photovoltaic lighting technology for net zero energy consumption. Family assist restrooms will low water consumption fixtures. Other amenities may include benches, picnic facilities and the like.
- vi. Park amenities: Beach nourishment where appropriate; invasive species control with native

plantings to include trees, pollinator gardens, and low/no mow options to increase carbon sequestration. Family friendly options could include nature play-scapes and rest areas along the trail corridor.

Project Rationale

Project Rationale – Area I

The City of Duluth has serious concerns for public safety, which have been confirmed through detailed engineering inspections and investigations of existing harbor sea wall conditions. This project will address these issues:

- Resiliency to withstand increasingly frequent and severe coastal storms,
- General public access and safety,
- Corrosion on existing sheet pile walls,
- Failing wood cribs and Wakefield walls,
- Failing 1880's relieving platforms and docks,
- Development of sink holes and undermining of docks,
- Operational reliability and safety issues with the Minnesota Slip Bridge,
- Failing steel sheet pile along the Baywalk,
- Underwater obstructions and debris,
- Shallow drafts next to existing dock walls,
- The need for environmental dredging along the failing docks,
- Navigation and environmental protection,
- Outdated shore services for vessels,
- Connectivity, trail development.

As critical health and safety issues were identified, they were immediately mitigated via temporary fencing, signs, and gates. In recent years, the waterfront area has experienced large deep sinkholes, soil erosion, ground settlement under concrete gathering areas, which are hazards to those who are walking and biking along the waterfront as well as vessels accessing the harbor and lake. These partial dock collapses are a precursor to a potential complete dock collapse. Failing and unstable docks create a hazard to vessels during mooring and berthing. The removal of these areas from public access due the major safety concerns greatly restricts the public's uses of the waterfront during major events. These areas also require significant staff maintenance and patrols to ensure the public does not enter the hazard areas.

Project Rationale – Area II

This project rehabilitates approximately 3,000 linear feet of shoreline, 7.5 miles of paved trail, and 5 acres of parkland. Please refer to Maps 2 - 6: Lakewalk Damage Sections. Please note that the shoreline areas labeled to illustrate FEMA, Minnesota Public Assistance, MNDot and Bonding funding.

Shoreline areas designated as FEMA, MN Public Assistance, or MN DOT are those areas that have failed and are in the process of repair or will be repaired using non-bonding dollars. The areas designated for bonding request are showing signs of eminent failure and represent significant public safety concerns. The obsolescence of the existing infrastructure undermines and reduces public safety, access, and enjoyment. This project will address these issues:

- Resiliency to withstand increasingly frequent and severe coastal storms ,
- General public access and safety,
- Failing shorelines not covered by FEMA or State Disaster Public Assistance funding,
- Accessibility upgrades,
- Energy consumption - reduced via photo voltaic lighting - goal is zero net energy,
- Stormwater control - systems will eliminate runoff over the bluff - goal is zero runoff,
- Environmental protection - carbon sequestration via planting native trees, pollinator species, removal of invasive species and beach nourishment,
- Connectivity, trail upgrades.

As part of the overall restoration, there is a need to improve connectivity between numerous connecting trails and the paved trail and boardwalk, update signage, provide safe and family friendly gathering space and access points, safe lake access areas, and update critical public infrastructure like restrooms, seating, railing/fencing and lighting. In keeping with the City's resiliency goals, crucial updates include storm water control to eliminate bank erosion; Solar Electric integration to offset lighting and other loads; greens space that is low/no mow, pollinator friendly, eliminates invasive species, promotes native species, sequesters carbon, and nourishes beaches.

Project Timeline

Design and Bid: Q3, 2020

Permitting and prep work: 2020

Implementation period: 2021 construction season

Other Considerations

The Lakewalk and the adjoining harbor are the centerpiece of a national tourist destination that serves six million visitors per year. The Duluth Lakewalk is well-known to all who live in or visit Duluth. It consistently is listed as one of the top attractions on tourism and visitor websites and guides. Loved by locals and tourists alike, the Duluth Lakewalk and its unique location on the shores of Lake Superior continues to draw high number of users in all four seasons and continually acts as a focal point for community events and bicycle/pedestrian commuters.

This area supports year round public activities along the Duluth waterfront. These major activities include Grandma's Marathon, Northshore Inline Marathon, Tall Ships Duluth Festival, Visiting Cruise and Research Vessels, Vista Fleet Harbor Tours, the Irvin Ore Ship Tours, Military Vessels, DECC Sports and Convention activities, Bayfront Festival Park, Bentleyville Tour of Lights, and The Great Lakes Aquarium. All activities in this area depend on providing safe walking and biking trails to the public along the waterfront.

The seawalls are also an integral part of the busiest port in the Great Lakes and the mooring location for a planned international cruise ship destination.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

State operating dollars are not being requested for this project

Who will own the facility?

City of Duluth

Who will operate the facility?

City of Duluth and the Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center (DECC)

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Duluth, DECC, and the general public

Public Purpose

The Duluth waterfront is a public asset that supports numerous activities and events. Rehabilitation of the Harbor sea walls and Lakewalk is required to ensure public safety and continued use of the waterfront by the public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Erik Birkeland
Property and Facilities Manager
218-576-7396
ebirkeland@DuluthMN.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$13.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Duluth Coastal Infrastructure Rehabilitation - Lakewalk and Harbor Sea Walls

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$13,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$18,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

East Itasca Sewer JPB

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| East Itasca Joint Sewer Board Regional Water Treatment Facility | 1 | GO | 750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

East Itasca Joint Sewer Board Regional Water Treatment Facility

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$750

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: This \$750,000 represents Phase 2 of a regional wastewater treatment facility project. Phase 1 of the project is in final stages of securing financing for construction in May 2020. The collaborating Cities are Keewatin, Nashwauk and Lone Pine Township. The total estimated project cost is \$13,490,600 million with Phase 2 cost at \$4,290,600 which primary constructon concentrated in Lone Pine Township and Nashwauk.

Project Description

This project resulted in pursuing formation of a regional wastewater treatment facility and subsequent creation of the East Itasca Joint Sewer Board (EIJSB) with representation from the Cities of Keewatin, Nashwauk and Lone Pine Township. The EIJSB will operate and maintain the expanded wastewater treatment facility located in the City of Nashwauk. The following existing regional wastewater treatment concerns resulted in the decision to pursue a regional wastewater treatment facility alternative:

- Lone Pine Township is an unsewered community located contiguous to Swan Lake that is served by subsurface sewer treatment system (SSTS) that Itasca County has determined are only 30-40% compliant with county SSTS standards.
- The Keewatin WWTF was upgraded in 1988. The system upgrade is over 30 years old and the process equipment needs immediate repair and replacement. The Imhoff tank, trickling filter and pump room/control building is over 70 year old. The facility has outgrown it's useful life and is in need of major overhaul. Following extensive review of alternatives, it was determined that the establishment of a regional wastewater treatment facility located in the City of Nashwauk was the most cost-effective alternative for meeting multiple regional wastewater treatment needs.
- Phase 1 of the project is in final stages of securing project financing that will result in final engineering tasks to move the project to an active construction stage in the Spring of 2020.
- Project Financing has been secured, or is pending from the following sources:
 - State Special appropriation (Engineering Tasks) **\$850,000 secured**
 - PFA (CWRLF, WIF, PSIG) **TBD**
 - DEED Small City Development Program **\$600,000 pending**
 - IRRRB **\$1,000,000**

Project Rationale

The Lone Pine Project Area consists of individual subsurface sewage treatment systems (SSTS) that consists of septic tanks, drywells and drain field, with newer systems being above ground mound systems. Itasca County estimates that 30-40% of the existing systems are compliant with County requirements. Failed septic systems have the potential of surface and ground water contamination.

Currently, private wells supply all the residential homes with potable water. In general, most systems have matured to a point that the on-site systems are becoming too costly or not possible.

Other concerns that demonstrate the need for eliminating SSTS's is that on the average residential sites consist of a home, garage, driveway and the initial septic systems. Future replacement on the site with a 50-foot setback from the well location makes existing lots exhibiting land restraints that prevent replacement of SSTS's. Soil conditions in the area are rated poorly to resort to a SSTS replacement system.

Project Timeline

1. **Conduct Individual SSTS systems :** Summer 2019
2. **Conduct Citizen Participation Meetings:** Summer/Fall 2019
3. **Citizen Township Approval:** Winter 2020
4. **Secure Project Financing:** July 2020
5. **Plans and Specifications to MPCA:** August 2020
6. **Advertise for Bids:** September 2020
7. **Bid Opening:** October 2020
8. **Construction Start:** November 2020
9. **Construction End:** July 2021

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Per Minnesota Public Facilities Authority requirements, the EIJSB has pursued all Federal, State, Regional and local project financing opportunities. These pursuits have included the following funding opportunities:

Who will own the facility?

City of Nashwauk

Who will operate the facility?

The East Itasca Joint Sewer Board will operate and maintain the facility

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Cities of Keewatin Nashwauk and Lone Pine Township

Public Purpose

The project will be a municipally owned cooperative that provides a cost-efficient regional wastewater treatment facility.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The East Itasca Joint Sewer Board was awarded ***Special Legislative Appropriation*** funding in **2018**. The amount and use of the funding were **\$850,000** for Engineer predesign, final design, preparation of bid documents, and construction management.

Project Contact Person

William King
Chairman East Itasca Joint Sewer Board
218-778-6517
keewatin@mchsi.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

East Itasca Sewer JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

East Itasca Joint Sewer Board Regional Water Treatment Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$272 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$3,269 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,291 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$272 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,019 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,291 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Ellsworth City Hall Multi-purpose Room and Public Works Shop | 1 | GO | 1,345 | 0 | 0 | 1,345 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,345 | 0 | 0 | 1,345 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,345 | 0 | 0 | 1,345 | 0 | 0 |

Ellsworth City Hall Multi-purpose Room and Public Works Shop

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,345

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Our small city, population 467, is reaching out for state funding in the amount of \$1,345,000 dollars, (project cost is estimated to be of \$2,691,349.54). The requested amount will be for the predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new building for the Ellsworth City Hall with multi purpose room, and Public Works Shop that was lost in the downtown fire on January 15th, 2019.

Project Description

Falls Architect and DGR Engineering have been working with the City of Ellsworth, along with the Ellsworth Building Committee and Ellsworth City Council to construct a City Hall with multi purpose room and a Public Works shop. The median estimate of the City Hall and multi purpose room is estimated at \$1,991,190.00 dollars. City Hall will be 5,182 square feet. The multi purpose room will be 7,500 square feet with an additional 2,427 Mezzanine. The Public Works shop is estimated \$317,000.00 for 3,360 square feet. Civil and Site work have been included in the totals. A total cost is \$2,691,349.54. The location of the City Hall and multi purpose room will be located on the main street. The Public Works building will be located next to the Ellsworth Fire Hall. Fundraising and donations will be accepted and is in the beginning stages of being set up. The City received a \$10,000.00 grant from Co Bank and Nobles Cooperative Electric to go towards the purchase of a new emergency siren that was lost in the fire.

Project Rationale

Our City Hall and Public Works building (that was connected to the City Hall) burned to the ground. The two story, 1904 brick building burned to the ground on January 15th, 2019. The City Council has decided to move forward and build a new structure. The function of the building will be the City Clerk's Office; City Council Chambers; Storage Area; Veterans storage, Auxiliary storage, and Vast Communications room; a Community room with a kitchen; multi purpose area; Fitness room; and restrooms. These are some areas that were lost in the fire. A separate building for the Public Works with 3 bays to house the two trucks and tractor that was lost in the fire, along will all the tools and small equipment. Total square footage of the City Hall that burned down was 8,064 square feet. The City was under insured for \$458,319.00 with a 150% replacement cost coverage of \$687,478.50 for the building and contents, which will take away the cost of the actual building structure. The city does have reserves, however, that is earmarked for needed street and infrastructure projects. Also, the City has had 3 disaster in the last 6 years. The Ice Storm in 2013; Electrical Outage in 2018; and the Fire of 2019. Therefore, the City of Ellsworth is in great need of funding and would appreciate your help.

Project Timeline

Hiring an Engineer and Architect April 2019. May soil boring per the engineer. Bid award August 2019. Begin construction October 2019. End construction and engineering July 1, 2020.

Other Considerations

I, the City Clerk-Treasurer, am located in the basement of the Zion Presbyterian Church. The cost is \$1,000.00 dollars per month. It is cold (brick basement) and drafty in the winter and very hot in the summer with no air conditioning. It also leaks down the bricks/walls when a heavy rain hits. I appreciate a place to be housed during the transition, but am truly looking forward to an office that I don't have to have a blanket and foot warmers to keep somewhat warm or a fan continually blowing air to dry the wet carpet! I am a veteran City Clerk of Ellsworth for 27 years. We are a border community and have not asked for much in a very, very long time. (Early 90's) We certainly need your help now. We realize there are other communities that are in need too, but I feel that our community is in dire need. Please help us.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional money is requested at this time.

Who will own the facility?

City of Ellsworth

Who will operate the facility?

City of Ellsworth

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Veterans, Auxiliary, Senior Citizens, Vast Communications, the Ellsworth Public School, local residents and the surrounding community of the Ellsworth area.

Public Purpose

Nobles County Environmental Clean up, Elections, land auctions, Assessment Hearings, Public Hearings, regular and special meetings, anniversaries, bridal or baby showers, wellness, choir concerts, band concerts, wedding dances, community picnics, Santa Claus day, Easter Bunny day, Pancake feeds, other community events, salad luncheons, Craft Fairs, Family Fun Days, Arts and Crafts, Ellsworth Community Club, 4-H, senior citizens.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Representative, Rod Hamilton, created a bill for a bond sale of \$950,000.00 SF 2839 as introduced - 91st Legislature (2019-2020). This was an estimate of cost. We did not have an architect or engineer hired at the time the 1.5 million was estimated.

Project Contact Person

Dawn Huisman
City Clerk-Treasurer
507-967-2373
cityofellsworthmn@gmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.345 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ellsworth City Hall Multi-purpose Room and Public Works Shop

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,345 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$1,346 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,691 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$139 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,552 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,691 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Ely Regional Trailhead Construction | 1 | GO | 2,800 | 0 | 0 | 2,800 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,800 | 0 | 0 | 2,800 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,800 | 0 | 0 | 2,800 | 0 | 0 |

Ely Regional Trailhead Construction

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$2,800**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The City of Ely is continuing to work with regional community partners on the construction of a regional trailhead complex and visitors center. The trailhead facility will serve the David Dill-Taconite Snowmobile Trail, the Mesabi Trail and the Prospector's Loop ATV Trail. The facility will also be utilized as a visitor's center

Project Description

The City of Ely is continuing to work with regional trail groups and community partners on the construction of a regional trailhead complex and visitors center. The trailhead facility will serve the David Dill Taconite Snowmobile Trail, the Mesabi Trail and the Prospector's Loop ATV Trail. The facility will also be utilized as a visitor's center. The first phase of the project consisting of the utility extension, access road construction and trailhead site grading is currently being advertised for bid with construction anticipated to start in late summer 2019 and be completed by Spring 2020.

The City of Ely is hereby submitting a request for capital budget consideration in the 2020 legislative session for the completion of the trailhead facility and necessary roadway improvements to provide access to the Trailhead facility and direct and safer access to the Ely Bloomenson Community Hospital. Along with providing necessary public infrastructure to support the planned Hospital expansion and the Ely Regional Recreation Facility being planned. The City of Ely continues to work with the Hospital, Ely Regional Recreation Facility Group, DNR, Prospector's Loop Trail Alliance and the Mesabi Trail to meet these groups specific needs. This project is the top priority for the City of Ely and the Ely Economic Development Authority again in 2019. Letters of support are also included from the Prospector's Loop, Ely Bloomenson Community Hospital, the Mesabi Trail, and the Ely Chamber of Commerce. The project is located on the west entrance to the City of Ely on City owned land. Other planned development in the area includes the construction of work force housing, market rate housing and the redevelopment of the old City garage site. These future projects include approximately \$1,200,000 in public infrastructure in addition to other private and public investments for building construction. This work is not part of this request.

The total cost for all portions of the trailhead, access road and utilities on this project is \$4,100,000. The amount of state funds requested in the 2020 bonding cycle is \$2,800,000. The trail projects are being funded by other funding sources and are not part of this request. The Ely Bloomenson Hospital Expansion and the Regional Recreation Facility are estimated to cost \$33,000,000.

The Prospectors Loop Alliance is working to develop a 250-mile all-terrain vehicle (ATV) trail system connecting Ely with two state parks and many other communities in the region by a designated route. This effort is a collaboration of all area cities, townships and Lake and St. Louis County. The trail is currently under construction. The trailhead facility is needed for parking, restroom facilities and support of the expected trail users. The region is very dependent on tourism for economic vitality and

the new trail system and trailhead are needed to attract new visitors to the area.

The Taconite Snowmobile Trail is also a significant economic and recreation resource for the businesses and citizens of the region. The DNR maintains the David Dill Taconite trail with the local snowmobile club maintaining the grants in aid spur trails that connect to Ely and the area lakes/resorts. The trailhead will be located on this trail system.

We are also working with the St. Louis and Lake County Rail Authority on the completion of the last section of the Mesabi Trail. The final segments to complete the route from Ely to Grand Rapids are planned to be completed by 2021. This will be a great asset for the region to attract additional visitors and drive economic development and additional recreation opportunities. The trailhead is located on the trail alignment for the Mesabi Trail. The Trailhead will service as both the starting point or ending point for many users of the trail. Currently new mountain bike trails are also being built at Ely's Hidden Valley Recreation Area that will also utilize the facility.

The trailhead facility is being designed to support all three trail systems and their specific needs. There will be large vehicle and trailer parking for ATV and snowmobile users and bike racks and rest areas for all trail users. By locating the trailhead at the entrance to Ely and where all three trail systems are in close proximity a shared trailhead can be developed. Rather than building individual trail head facilities for each group a common facility is planned. This will greatly reduce capital and operating expenses and provide an opportunity for a collaborative facility. The facility will also be located on the west entrance to Ely. The majority of visitors to the Ely Area and the Boundary Waters travel to Ely on TH 169. This facility will provide these visitors an opportunity to stop at a public restroom and collect local information when they arrive. Currently this service is provided by the Visitors Center located at the far end of Ely making it difficult to find for new visitors to the area.

The first phase of the project that is being funded by the bonding funds secured in 2018 are being used to provide the necessary infrastructure and access road for the trailhead facility. The City of Ely is requesting \$2,800,000 to complete the trailhead building and the roadway that will connect the trailhead to the Ely Bloomenson Community Hospital Campus and back to existing streets and County Highway 21. The Ely Bloomenson Community Hospital Board has currently completed their master facilities plan which will include a large expansion of services. To support the expansion of services the facility will have a large addition to the west. To provide for access to the Hospital and provide for a safer route for the ambulance service, the construction of 5th Avenue West between Pattison Street and TH 169 and Pattison Street from County Highway 21 is needed. Without this public infrastructure construction, the expansion of the Hospital will not be possible. Additional parking will also be needed for the facility expansion. The concept sketch showing this expansion has been provided. The City is also working with the Ely Regional Community Complex Group on the construction of a recreation facility. This facility will be built in conjunction with the Ely Bloomenson Community Hospital project and share the same infrastructure. Construction on both the Hospital expansion and recreation facility are anticipated in 2021. The extension of the roadway and public infrastructure is required to support these developments. Without the public infrastructure these projects will not proceed.

The Ely Area Ambulance Service is also working to construct a new facility in close proximity to the Hospital campus. The ambulance service is a full-time service with three ambulances and one paramedic chase vehicle. The Board of Directors are currently working to finalize their plans. The construction of the roadway extensions will greatly improve emergency vehicle access to the Hospital as well as providing an alternative route to the current residential streets.

The City of Ely has also been planning the redevelopment of City owned land that was once used as

the public works garage and would be considered a brown field site. The City of Ely and the local HRA have completed a housing study that addresses the current need for work force housing, market rate and senior housing. The City of Ely will continue to develop this as a master plan to incorporate future recreation, economic, residential and public health and safety in this area. This project would be completed in future phases. It is estimated that this future phase of this project including the ambulance garage, housing and other private development will cost in excess of \$3,000,000. These projects will be funded from other sources and are not part of this current bonding request.

The trailhead facility, roadway and utility lines will be owned and maintained by the City of Ely. All of the improvements requested are City owned. This is a shovel ready project that could be completed in 2020. The first phase of the project will be under construction during the summer of 2019.

Project Rationale

The City of Ely is currently working with the Prospectors Loop Alliance Board, The Mesabi Trail Group and the Minnesota DNR and local snowmobile clubs concerning the trail systems connecting Ely to the rest of the Region. Through the development and promotion of these trail systems a significant economic impact can be realized by the City of Ely, the region and the State of Minnesota.

With these three regional trails coming to Ely, a trail head is needed to accommodate these trail users as well as the tens of thousands of tourists that travel to Ely and the region. This is a regional project and the Ely tax payers do not have the capacity to fund this regional project.

By planning for the convergence of all three trail systems at the west entrance to Ely a combined trail head can be utilized for all three trail systems. This combined effort will reduce redundancy and reduce overall project costs. The combined trail head will also allow for reduced future maintenance and reduce the overall burden on the tax payers.

The expansion of the Hospital and Regional Recreation Complex requires improved access from Highway 21 and TH 169. The expanded services offered at the Hospital will be a benefit to all residents in the area. The Ely Bloomenson Hospital provides services to a large geographical area in the region and the potential for expanding the current rehabilitation services will greatly benefit and improve health and wellness in the region. The improvements will also provide for a more direct and safer access for the ambulance service and those visiting the hospital.

Project Timeline

Design: December 2018- February 2020
Secure Funding: March 2020
Bidding: March 2020
Construction: May 2020- June 2021

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Unknown

Who will own the facility?

City of Ely

Who will operate the facility?

City of Ely

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Ely, trail groups, visitors center

Public Purpose

Provide for a regional trailhead facility and visitors center. Provide infrastructure for access to existing roadways and trails from trailhead.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$1,300,000 received in 2018 bonding for phase one site work and utilities

Project Contact Person

Harold R. Langowski P.E.
Clerk-Treasurer
218-226-5474
elyod@ely.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.8 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ely Regional Trailhead Construction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$1,300 | \$2,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$1,300 | \$2,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$1,300 | \$2,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,300 | \$2,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| City of Eveleth Public Buildings Improvements | 1 | GO | 1,020 | 0 | 0 | 1,020 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,020 | 0 | 0 | 1,020 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,020 | 0 | 0 | 1,020 | 0 | 0 |

City of Eveleth Public Buildings Improvements

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$1,020**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City has five landmark buildings (City Hall/Police Station, Carnegie Library, Fire/Ambulance Hall, Hippodrome ice arena, Auditorium) which are integral components of city operations in need of improvements—indoor air quality/ventilation/heating, restroom updates, exterior tuckpointing, and roof.**Project Description**

City Hall/Police Station - add fresh air ventilation, new furnace systems with air conditioning, new City Hall roof; Carnegie Library - add fresh air ventilation, new furnace system with air conditioning, add exhaust fans to serve toilet rooms; Fire/Ambulance Hall - add fresh air ventilation, add exhaust systems, add CO and NO2 detection, exterior masonry restoration; Hippodrome ice arena - remodel men's and women's public restrooms, exterior masonry restoration; Auditorium - exterior masonry restoration.

Project Rationale

These buildings, while old, meet our current space needs. The City Council has intentionally made improvements/repairs to these building in lieu of building new facilities. We have replaced roofs, repaired the exteriors, and done interior modifications/updates over many years. Our Library is a Carnegie Library.

Our request addresses an important need of providing fresh air (and the necessary heating and cooling systems) to buildings which currently have no fresh air and have indoor air quality concerns. Exterior masonry restoration and new roof ensures our building envelopes keep the buildings structurally sound and protect the integrity of the interiors for many years to come. Remodeled restrooms are necessary to maintain the interior of the Hippodrome.

The City has made significant investments in our water treatment system, wastewater treatment system, done significant street (including utility) improvements, made necessary equipment purchases, and due to limited cash resources, the City is asking for assistance with these important public facility improvements.

Project Timeline

Project design will commence after capital budget funding is approved and appropriate paperwork is completed.

Commencement of improvements will start fall/winter 2020-2021.

Completion of improvements fall/winter 2021.

Other Considerations

Eveleth is a pro-active City: the City Council is committed to taking care of our assets; making public

infrastructure improvements is a priority; creative economic development has enabled us to repurpose vacant buildings for business; our Police Department proactively enforces blight, we proactively apply for and receive grants for downtown and business corridor improvements, infrastructure, and brownfields cleanup.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Eveleth

Who will operate the facility?

City of Eveleth

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The city of Eveleth staff and partner agencies occupy: City Hall/Police Station (City Hall during normal working hours; Police Station 24/7), Fire/Ambulance Hall (occupied 24/7 by EMTs; training and fire calls by firefighters), Carnegie Library (during normal operating hours), Auditorium (used for various City/community/regional meetings)

The public will use the Carnegie Library, City Hall/Police Station to conduct their business, the Auditorium is available for rent by private/public parties; and the public will be at the Fire/Ambulance Hall for designated City sponsored events.

Public Purpose

All buildings are and will continue to be owned and operated by the City of Eveleth.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Jackie Monahan-Junek
City Administrator
218-744-7563
jackie@evelethmn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.02 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

City of Eveleth Public Buildings Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,020 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,020 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,040 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$104 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$104 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,832 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,040 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Community Park Building | 1 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 |

Community Park Building

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Falcon Heights is requesting funds to replace our Community Park Building that is used as the central gathering location for city events, community events, and park and recreation program. The building is beyond its useful life and does not meet current and or future needs.

Project Description

Falcon Heights Community Park is located in the upper northwest corner of Falcon Heights near the intersection of Roselawn Avenue and Cleveland Avenue. This is the largest park in the city and used as a central playground for numerous children in the Falcon Heights, Roseville, and Saint Paul communities. It is also the central gathering place for numerous community events in and around Falcon Heights and summer Recreation On The Go events serving Roseville and Falcon Heights. The park is also rented for parties, reunions, picnics, and events. As the central park in the Falcon Heights area which includes the University of Minnesota the park serves a broader purpose than neighborhood parks by focusing on meeting community-based recreational needs as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. The park provides an appropriate blend of active and passive amenities to service a broad spectrum of interests and age groups. The park is also the main gathering place for the city of Falcon Heights.

After hearing numerous concerns from residents regarding various issues with the city’s parks in general and with Community Park in particular the city of Falcon Heights in 2013 undertook the bold step of commissioning a study facilitated by WSB and Associates Inc. WSB produced a report entitled Falcon Heights Park Improvement Study on May 21, 2014. Among the findings of that report in relationship to Community Park were the following:

WSB recommended potential improvement costs for improvements as listed ranging from \$600,000 to \$800,000 depending on the building costs and the extent of changes to the site layout.

Almost six years have gone by since that report and no substantive or significant improvements have been made to the issues in Community Park identified in the report. The specific issues have only worsened including widening gaps in the concrete making it difficult for users, particularly seniors and individuals with disabilities, to safely navigate the pavement in and around the park building where a variety of community events serving Falcon Heights and neighboring cities and the University of Minnesota are held.

The City of Falcon Heights seeks to address specific issues identified the report and is asking for \$1,000,000 to cover these costs based on the worsening conditions identified in the 2014 report, inflation, and a more detailed assessment of what is needed for renovation and repair.

Project Rationale

According to the National Recreation and Parks Association, parks and recreation have three values that make them essential services to communities:

1. Economic value
2. Health and Environmental benefits
3. Social importance

Among the values making them essential services are the following:

- Parks improve the local tax base and increase property values. Private property values increase the value of privately owned land the closer such land is to parks. This increase in private property value due to the proximity to parks increases property tax revenues and improves local economics.
- Parks and recreation programs and services contribute to the health of children, youth, adults, and seniors.
- Parks provide gathering places for families and social groups, as well as for individuals of all ages and economic status, regardless of their ability to pay for access.
- Access to parks and recreation opportunities has been strongly linked to reductions in crime and to reduced juvenile delinquency.
- Parks have a value to communities that transcend the amount of dollars invested or the revenues gained from fees. Parks provide a sense **of public pride and cohesion** to every community.

Falcon Heights already has fewer parks per acre than most communities in Minnesota. According to the Trust for Public Land, 2017 City Parks Facts:

The Median amount of park land as a percentage of adjusted city area is between 8.1 to 12.1%. According to the City of Falcon Heights, 2040 Comprehensive Plan only 2% of City area is consider park land, with a percentage drop to 1.3% by 2040. Community Park makes up over 55% of all Falcon Heights's park land.

Community Park is the central gathering point for most community functions and a social gathering point for many in the community and its' adjacent communities. The parks need for repairs and replacement is nearing a point where portions of the park such as the park building and pavement may need to be shut down in the near future shuttering an integral gathering point for a great deal of community cohesion

In the wake of the Philando Castile shooting in Falcon Heights, the community, city staff, and city leadership are already doing everything they can to promote community cohesion and cultivate a caring community. Further deterioration of the park and the possible closing of the park building and other amenities only makes the cultivating of a caring community and enhancing community cohesion more difficult. The city has faced additional financial challenges in moving its' police force to a new force in the last two years increasing that portion of the budget by almost \$400,000 for a small, aging community. The increased tax levy needed this past year to cover police costs and other costs was **over 24%**. During the first year of the new police contract, the City was facing a 34% tax levy increase, the City Council reluctantly used reserves to bring down the levy to a level that was acceptable. This is not a sustainable tool to use for future needs. The city's aging community does not appear to support an added burden of additional taxes to cover the needs to the park on top of the 24% increase in the levy for FY2019 along with the added costs to cover the Roseville Area School Districts 2017 building bond referendum which adds approximately **\$39 per month in property tax increases** to a \$250,000 residence in Roseville and Falcon Heights according to the Roseville Area Schools November 2017 Bond Referendum Information (<https://www.isd623.org/our->

district/welcome/building-bond-2017/cost). Furthermore, the park is needed to support active lifestyles and to support the concept of aging in place by giving seniors a safe area to walk and participate in physical activities.

In short, the community has seen increases in assessments, taxes, and fees of over \$60 a month in the past two years while watching its' central community park deteriorate rapidly after already having been documented as being in serious need of repair viz' a 2014 consultant assessment. Since that assessment the community has endured a fatal shooting and worked hard to build community in the aftermath of the shooting. Our work resulted in the League of Minnesota Cities 2018 City of Excellence Award for cities with a population of 5,000-19,999. We have been a fortunate city in having so many residents, staff, and leadership come forward to pour a great deal of time into improving the community. However, in order for this progress to continue, for our residents and neighbors to have a central gathering point, for our seniors to have an anchor for activity to help age in place, for our children to continue to have strong park programming, and finally for our residents to obtain some needed financial relief while living in a high quality city we think this project deserves a very high priority ranking of projects to be funded in the current session.

Project Timeline

2018: Preliminary planning, public engagement viz' city survey

2018-2019: Predesign, Plan, Specifications, Bidding

February-July 2020: Engineering and design construction document development

July 2020-September 2020: Permitting

May 2021-October 2021: Construction

Other Considerations

The University of Minnesota as our partner through a lease and as the lessor of the property to the city and a letter indicates that they are willing to work with the City on renegotiating the lease to extend the term of the lease as may be a condition of funding to serve the needs of Falcon Heights, the University of Minnesota, and adjacent communities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The University owns the land and the park is operated by the City of Falcon Heights. The University will continue to own the existing as well as proposed improvements.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Falcon Heights will continue to operate the facility. The city currently operates the land and park through a lease with the University of Minnesota which has been in place and continued for nearly fifty years.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Falcon Heights, Saint Paul, Roseville, and Minneapolis residents as well as University of Minnesota staff and faculty, visitors to the area, and visitors driving through the area.

Public Purpose

Community Park is a central gathering space for residents and the surrounding communities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Sack Thongvanh
City Administrator
651-792-7611
sack.thongvanh@falconheights.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Community Park Building

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,174 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,174 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$198 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$230 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$146 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,174 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Water Reclamation Facility Flood Mitigation and Bank Stabilization Project | 1 | GO | 1,930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,930 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Water Reclamation Facility Flood Mitigation and Bank Stabilization Project

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$1,930 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$1.93 million in State funds is requested for the design and construction of flood mitigation measures and bank stabilization at the Water Reclamation Facility in Faribault, Minnesota. |

Project Description

A multiphase project for the construction of flood mitigation measures and bank stabilization to protect the Water Reclamation Facility (WRF) from flooding of the Straight River. The project will construct preventative measures that provide a minimum of 2 feet of freeboard over United States Geological Survey (USGS) high water marks of the 2010 flood of record. The project will include the following:

- The construction of approximately 1,715 feet of flood barrier including 995 feet of floodwall and 720 feet of levee along the west side of the WRF.
- The construction of an eastern floodwall tieback and road closure system.
- The construction of 1,900 feet of streambank stabilization along the east bank of the Straight River.
- Make improvements (elevating to allow access under flooding conditions) to a key sanitary sewer structure that collects wastewater from the northern and industrial park service areas of the community.

Project Rationale

The facility has experienced three flooding events since 2010, where the facility was off line for seven days. Flooding in 2014 and 2016 resulted in the construction of a temporary levee to prevent damage to WRF equipment. These flooding events also caused a significant amount of streambank erosion, which continues to increase the threat to critical infrastructure including large trunk sanitary sewer collection systems.

The project is necessary to protect the WRF from future flooding of the Straight and Cannon Rivers. Permanent mitigation measures are required to ensure that the WRF can operate without interruption, thus minimizing environmental and human health impacts. The project will also minimize financial impacts previous flooding caused to the City’s large industrial customers, which were required to either shut down or reduce operations because of the WRF being offline.

Project Timeline

Funding availability and acquisition of the required agency permits will determine the project schedule. It could take up to two years for permitting and final design, pending no major obstacles in the permitting process. The project can be completed in one construction season. A tentative schedule would be:

January 2019 - Permit Application and Final Design

January 2020 - Bidding
June 2020 - Construction

Other Considerations

The City is currently repaying a \$23.3M Public Facilities Authority (PFA) loan that the City obtained to make improvements to the WRF in 2008. The \$26M improvement project was necessary to meet permit effluent limits. The loan has annual debt service payments of approximately \$1.5M, continuing through 2029.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

The City of Faribault

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Faribault

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The City of Faribault

Public Purpose

The project will provide protection for the WRF, which treats wastewater for the City of Faribault and discharges into the Straight River. Completing a project that provides permanent protective measures, ensures the facility is able to remain operational while preserving the environment and public health.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Travis Block
Public Works Director
507-333-0365
tblock@ci.faribault.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Reclamation Facility Flood Mitigation and Bank Stabilization Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,930 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,105 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,035 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$235 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,035 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Fergus Falls Downtown Riverfront Improvements | 1 | GO | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,250 | 0 | 0 |

Fergus Falls Downtown Riverfront Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,250

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$2.25 million in state funds is requested for construction of a downtown riverfront corridor improvement project to include an amphitheater, river market, river balcony, public arts space, interactive water components and related publicly owned infrastructure and amenities in Downtown Fergus Falls.

Project Description

The Fergus Falls Downtown Riverfront improvement project spans two blocks, from Mill St. to Union Ave. along the north side of the Otter Tail River, which runs right through the middle of town. This two block stretch of riverfront currently serves exclusively as public parking. The proposed project would utilize the river bank and a small portion of the existing public parking area for construction of a Riverfront Balcony/Trail, a public amphitheater a river market structure, public arts installations and an interactive water feature. The total project cost is \$4.5 million, as no acquisition costs are necessary.

The riverfront balcony runs the entire stretch of the project area and will serve as a multi-modal pedestrian trail, connecting the riverfront area to the larger proposed regional Glacial Edge Trail. The balcony will be ADA compliant and will feature decorative concrete. This balcony will serve as the host of many of the other featured amenities, such as pergola shade structures, public art and water features. The balcony enhances the existing Riverwalk on the south side of the river, by serving as an alternate pedestrian connection to many important downtown destinations. The cost of the riverfront balcony improvements is \$1,077,000.

The amphitheater is located directly behind City Hall, across the river and adjacent to the Federal Court House. City Hall and the Otter Tail River will serve as the backdrop to the 40' X 20' stage structure, with seating for 250 in a terraced arrangement featuring limestone blocks and concrete walkways. There is overflow lawn seating designed for an additional 150 people, with other areas, including the balcony serving as additional overflow where bleachers and lawn chairs can be brought in for large performances. The amphitheater also includes various improvements such as lighting and sound systems, a staging area and an ADA accessible path that connects the Riverfront Balcony to the stage and public seating. The amphitheater will be owned by the City of Fergus Falls and will be open to the public to use and/or reserve. The vision is that many organizations will host events in this space, including our weekly concert in the park series that currently attracts nearly 200 people every week to a local park. A local trust has expressed their support to his project by committing \$700,000 towards the amphitheater component of the project. The total cost of the amphitheater component of the project is \$827,000.

The River Market Structure is located adjacent to the river on the west block area of the development, nearest to Union Ave. This is located close to the busiest intersection in Fergus Falls and will serve as a hub of activity and economic activity. The Market Structure will be approximately 170' X 35' and will

provide 10' wide market spaces and a 10' wide central walkway between sides. This structure will be the new home of the Fergus Falls Farmers Market, which hosts the market twice a week and is well attended. It will also serve as space that can be rented or used by the public for events, gatherings, reunions, picnics, or other market type occasions. Further, this is an ideal location for components of City-Wide events, including our annual Summerfest, Shop, Move & Groove in July and the Over the River event in December. The Market Structure will also feature plaza space on the river side, including moveable seating and decorative lighting. The River Market component of the project is supported by the Morning Rotary Club. This group has pledged \$50,000 of the \$400,000 total cost. Additionally \$5,000 has been received from a West Central Initiative Change Makers grant for this component.

Public art installations, including decorative monument archways along Union Ave. and Court St., as well as potential sculptures and decorative wayfinding and kiosks will be located throughout the project. The City has applied to the National Endowment of the Arts (NEA) for a \$200,000 grant related to these installations, as well as funding for programming in the first year at the above referenced amphitheater. The interactive water feature component is located near the amphitheater and is currently slated to be 1,000 sq. feet in size. The Noon Rotary group is sponsoring this component and is proposing providing \$80,000 towards this project. The City is further exploring the upsizing of this improvement, so additional interactive, site appropriate, features can be added.

Beyond these components of the project, there are other various infrastructure improvements, including decorative lighting, decorative metal railings along the river, a 20' X 30' public restroom facility, including storage for the amphitheater, intersection bump outs and storm water planters, among others. Most of these components are included in the Balcony portion of this project.

The total project cost is \$4.5 million, with the hope of half of that cost being provided by State bonding and the remainder through the local initiatives I highlighted and through City financing.

Project Rationale

The City of Fergus Falls has been especially hard by the downtrend in retail, including the closure of multiple big box stores. Within the past few years, the City has lost Kmart, Target, Herbergers, Shopko and SunMart, to name a few. This has shown us the importance of focusing on retail of a different scale, including small local business and downtown merchants. While we continue to address the large vacant buildings and nearly empty and deteriorating mall in town, we have concluded that we need to turn our focus to the downtown area, immediately. It just so happens that downtown Fergus Falls has the Otter Tail River running right through the middle of it, providing the opportunity to combine the two and really drive activity and commerce. The Otter Tail River is a beautiful natural asset that has been under-utilized, as we have turned our "backs" to the river.

After doing a nearly 18 month Master Planning process, that engaged hundreds of stakeholders in town, it became evident that it was time to embrace the river and make this a focal point of our Community. With the increased focus on improving the Riverfront and the need to support and revive the downtown business district and small business, we landed on this project. This project will increase the quality of life in Fergus Falls, will drive social and economic activity and will serve as a gathering place for many in the Community. These amenities will be first-rate and the beauty of this now utilized area will bring visitors from near and far. This will serve as a revival of this Community, embracing two of the most important things, our natural assets and our beautiful historic downtown.

This Community needs a "win" and this project can serve as that. This project will breed new life into the downtown area and will become the busiest and most concentrated area of town. Since the

conversation started around this project, multiple new businesses have opened and located in this area, citing this project as their motivation. Other prospective businesses are in the works, related to the excitement and energy around this project. Most recently, Otter Cove, a new Children's Museum and Indoor Playground decided to locate adjacent to the amphitheater and water feature, so they can use and provide synergy with these improvements.

An influx of young family and students has put the City in a position to explore additional recreational opportunities. As a Community without an aquatic center or splash pad, these improvements immediately address that much desired need. Fergus Falls has not been immune to the work force challenges seen across the State and many studies show that Quality of Life, Trail Systems and Natural Beauty are all driving forces for our younger workforce to choose a Community. This project immediately puts Fergus Falls on the map for all of those reasons.

In summary, this project will serve a lot of needs for the Community, including a renewed focus on the downtown business district, increased social opportunities, engagement with the River, increased recreational opportunities and ultimately an increased quality of life.

Project Timeline

Preliminary Design Start July 2019-Complete September 2019
Private Utility Relocations Start October 2019 -Complete June 2020
Construction Documents Start September 2019 -Complete January 2020
Project Bidding- June 2020
Construction Start -August 2020
Complete Construction -October 2021
Project Closeout - July 2022

The design of the entire Fergus Falls Downtown River Front Improvements will include all the design elements. This includes the 'trail' which will be constructed early in the 2020 construction season. This trail will run adjacent to the river and will be contiguous to the rest of the planned improvements. In addition to the planned improvements a portion of Union Street will also be modified to allow for the safe crossings of pedestrians into the area of the Downtown River Front Improvements, the improvements to Union Avenue are expected to be completed in spring of 2021 to provide the enhanced pedestrian crossing for access and use of the amenities. Prior to beginning construction of the amenities Ottertail Power Company will be relocating some of their infrastructure from the area of the planned improvements, these relocation will need to be completed and operational prior to beginning construction of the trail and the rest of the Downtown Riverfront Improvements. Ottertail Power Company has committed to relocating the infrastructure once the preliminary design has been completed and the locations for their new infrastructure has been identified.

Other Considerations

This project highlights the collaborative spirit of Fergus Falls, as well as the Community buy-in of this concept. As you will note, the financing includes local City bonding, as well as contributions from a local Trust, two local service clubs and private donations from philanthropic individuals and businesses. This project is a result of a large scale master plan, which engaged hundreds of interested parties and stakeholders. The pre-design and design processes related to this project gave the public several opportunities to provide input and to participate, ultimately leading us to the project that is before you and ready to proceed.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There will be no impact on State Operating Subsidies as a result of this project.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Fergus Falls will be the owner of all of the proposed public improvements associated with this project.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Fergus Falls will operate and maintain the improvements in this project. There may be partnerships formed that provide programming or operation of the amphitheater, but that would be with a local non-profit group and would not impact ownership, use or liability.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

All of these public improvements will be available for broad and flexible use and a diversity of programming and interests will be encouraged.

Public Purpose

This project establishes, improves and maintains outdoor public recreation facilities and a park along the Otter Tail River. These improvements will be publicly owned, operated and maintained.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Andrew Bremseth
City Administrator
218-332-5403
andrew.bremseth@ci.fergus-falls.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.25 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Fergus Falls Downtown Riverfront Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$715 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$330 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$698 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$162 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,640 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Sanitary Sewer System Reconstruction | 1 | GO | 920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Sanitary Sewer System Reconstruction

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$920

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Flensburg is requesting \$920,000 for a reconstruction of their deteriorated sanitary sewer collection system which is at the end of its useable life. Total project costs are \$1,840,000.

Project Description

An analysis has been made to reline the existing or reconstruct. It was determined that while both are viable options, that reconstruction makes more sense for longevity and soundness. The existing system is clay tile and more than 50 years old. Clay tile has areas of cracks and places where water infiltration has and will continue to occur. This make the system overburdened and not feasible to treat the volumes of water/affluent that are created by infiltration of water due to damaged clay tile.

Project Rationale

This project is needed to serve the citizens and businesses in Flensburg. The sanitary sewer system is at the end of life. A new system will create a long term solution for the community along with a health and safety factor. With water infiltration the system is overburdened and has become economically unfeasible as well as future health and safety issues will arise. This new system will carry the city into the next 40 plus years and reduce infiltration and safety/health issues.

Project Timeline

- Pre-design - Spring 2019
- Design - Winter/Spring 2020
- Construction - Summer/Fall 2020

Other Considerations

Flensburg is a very small community population 225. With having a small community with limited resources and low median income it is essential to seek State funding for this project. Without this funding it will be an economic burden on the community to try to finance this project without State bonding funds solely on our own.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The city will be responsible for annual operations and maintenance.

Who will own the facility?

City of Flensburg

Who will operate the facility?

City of Flensburg

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Flensburg

Public Purpose

Municipal City to serve its citizens and businesses with waste water services.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

John Gessell
Mayor
320-630-2023
jlgessell@outlook.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Sanitary Sewer System Reconstruction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$920 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$920 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,840 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,540 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,840 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$1,000,000 in State Funds is requested to design and construct Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements in the City of Floodwood.

Project Description

Wastewater Treatment System Improvements

The proposed project would consist of improvements to the existing wastewater treatment facility allowing it to continue operations at its design capacity for the future. These improvements would consist of structure replacements, piping replacements, pond dike/earthwork improvements, sludge removal and lift station improvements all feasible and necessary to continue operation and provide necessary capacity to meet current and permit requirements. A dike stability analysis is proposed to evaluate the stability of the existing dikes. Costs to complete the wastewater treatment system improvements total \$935,000.

The proposed improvements are necessary because these items have exceeded their design life. Improvements are feasible, replace existing components and no special project construction or barriers have been identified. The project is cost effective by replacing these items in lieu of building an entire facility, and will provide an operable wastewater treatment system for the City of Floodwood.

Wastewater Collection System Improvements

The proposed project would consist of improvements to existing manholes and development of an Inflow and Infiltration Assessment Plan for future use and prioritization of and planning for further improvements. Manhole replacement and rehabilitation initially will reduce the number of excessive wastewater flow events that have occurred and reduce the volume of wastewater pumped to the treatment facility. Costs to complete the collection system improvements total \$64,000.

The proposed improvements are necessary because they have exceeded their design life. Improvements are feasible, replace existing components and no special project construction or barriers have been identified. The project is cost effective by replacing these items and reducing future operating costs by eliminating the need to pump unnecessary water to the wastewater treatment facility. Completion of the project will provide an operable wastewater collection system for the City of Floodwood.

Project Rationale

Control Structures

Floodwood’s Wastewater Treatment Facility includes 4 control structures used to operate, transfer between ponds and discharge treated wastewater.

In the past years the structures have had general maintenance and repairs completed to allow them to operate the pond system. In 2005 two structures were repaired with a monofrom manhole sealing

system to maintain the integrity of the structures. The structures do not have any valves before or after the inlet or outlet between the ponds or outfall, and are continuously underwater.

The structures were originally constructed with shear gates at the bottom of the structure below the low water pond operating depth. The MPCA has requested removal of these shear gates when possible.

In March 2018 the bottom of Control Structure 4 broke causing a release of wastewater into the ground. In June of 2018 a temporary repair was completed to Control Structure 4 to the broken areas of the concrete structure and allow it to return to normal operation.

All of the structures have reached their design life and should be considered for replacement due to their age.

Pond Piping, Valves, Manholes

The Floodwood Wastewater Treatment Facility includes piping and manholes. Piping is used to distribute wastewater to either pond upon arrival, transfer wastewater between ponds and to discharge treated wastewater to the outfall.

Piping from Structure 1 to the outfall, and between Structure 1 and Structure 2 was televised in 2018. During the televising, piping between Structure 1, Manhole 1 and the outfall was noted to be in fair to good condition. Piping between Structure 1 and Structure 2 was unable to be televised due to bends or blockages encountered. The piping between Structure 1 and Structure 2 has not been in service for many years due to an unknown problem. Manhole 1, located between Structure 1 and the outfall, is in poor condition.

Piping between Structure 1 and Structure 3 appears to be in good condition. This piping cannot be televised because it is always underwater. There have been no known operational issues with this piping.

Due to the age and unknown condition of the pipe between Structure 2 and Manhole 1, this piping should be replaced to be able to resume operation of this piping and operation of the pond system to allow a discharge directly from the primary pond when applicable.

Pond Grading/Earthwork

Floodwood's wastewater ponds were constructed in 1969/1970. The pond system includes earthwork grading to construct the dikes holding the wastewater. Maintenance of the earthwork generally consists of mowing, vegetation control, varmint control, access roadway maintenance and general review of the slopes.

The existing gravel access road is in need of regrading and new aggregate surfacing to provide an acceptable driving surface for general maintenance, access and observations. The exterior earthen dikes are in need of minor grading to smooth out the surface for ease of maintenance mowing.

Following the breakage of the bottom of Control Structure 4, MPCA staff suggest an evaluation of soil stability, including berm/dike stability is warranted in the vicinity of Structure 4 due to the volume of wastewater discharged. Observations of the berm over the past year have not indicated any stability concerns.

Fencing

Fencing around the facility provides warning and safety for the wastewater facility. There is

approximately 4,000 feet of fence surrounding the pond system. Generally, the fencing is considered in good condition. About 10 years ago improvements and repairs were completed to approximately 50% of the fencing that required improvements.

Improvements to the fencing at this time will generally be limited to an area where piping is proposed to be replaced.

Access Road

Along the top of the pond dikes an access road exists to allow normal operation and maintenance access to the ponds. This access roadway is in poor condition inhibiting access to the pond system.

Pond Sludge

Preliminary measurements of sludge in the ponds were taken in 2019. The primary pond measurements indicated 4 to 5 inches of a hard sludge above the top clay layer of pond bottom. Secondary pond measurements indicated 3 inches of a soft sludge, above 5 to 6 inches of a hard sludge above the top clay layer of pond bottom. Previous sludge removal has occurred in the primary pond approximately 30 years ago. No sludge removal in the secondary ponds has been known to occur. The original plans indicate the pond bottoms were constructed at an elevation of 1257. Control Structures 2, 3 and 4 were constructed such that the minimum elevation of water discharge is at elevation 1258. Further accumulation of sludge could result in future solids being released during a discharge. Cleaning of the pond bottom could provide an increase of capacity, and would return the pond back to normal operational depth by removal of sludge to the original pond bottom.

Lift Stations

Floodwood's wastewater treatment system includes a main lift station located in the east central portion of the City. This main lift station collects all the wastewater from the City's collection system and pumps it to the wastewater treatment facility. Over the years controls, pumps and other related items have been maintained regularly. Pumps and controls have exceeded their design life and are recommended for replacement.

Wastewater Collection System Conditions

Floodwood's wastewater collection system consists of 20,000 feet of PVC collection pipe constructed between the 1980's and 8,800 feet of VCP pipe constructed many years ago. A collection system map is included in the attachments. In 2016, 65% of the collection system was cleaned and televised. The televising did not reveal any problem areas.

In 2016 following the cleaning and televising, with the assistance of Minnesota Rural Water Association (MRWA), smoke testing was completed. Results of the smoke testing were inconclusive to revealing significant inflow or infiltration problems or problem areas.

Discussions with City staff have resulted in determining that some manholes could benefit from some minor rehabilitation to reduce inflow problems. It was discussed there are some manholes located in or near ditch bottoms, some manholes without solid covers (covers with holes), some manholes with leaks between the top of the manhole structure and manhole frame.

Wastewater Treatment System Improvements

Control Structures

The control structures age, past maintenance and repairs, conditions and recent problems lead to a need to replace the control structures to allow continuation of the normal operation of the treatment system and provide acceptable wastewater treatment for the future.

Replacing each of the four control structures would involve removal of the existing structure and

replacing with a new reinforced concrete structure similar to the existing. Valves would be added as applicable to the piping to allow the structures to be operated and maintained more effectively. Removal and replacement of the control structures would be completed such that the existing pond liner would not be disturbed. Replacing the control structures is an immediate need to allow continued operation of the facility.

Pond Piping, Valves and Manholes

The pond piping provides proper operation of the wastewater treatment facility. Due to the condition of the piping between Structure 1 and Manhole 2, this piping should be replaced with new pipe. The condition of Manhole 1 indicates the need to replace this manhole. Replacing this piping and the manhole is an immediate need to allow continued operation of the facility.

Pond Grading/Earthwork

Minor pond grading of the top of the dikes, and exterior slopes should be completed. The existing access roadway should be improved. Various areas along the exterior dike slopes need minor grading to smooth out minor erosion, varmint holes and other areas that have become rough for ease of maintenance mowing. A geotechnical evaluation of the berm/dike stability has been suggested by MPCA staff and is included in the recommendations. Completion of this minor grading work is an immediate need to allow continued operation of the facility.

Pond Cleaning

Preliminary measurements of sludge in the primary and secondary pond bottoms encountered 4 to 6 inches of sludge in the bottom of the ponds. Removal and disposal of the accumulated sludge and settled soils would allow the ponds to return to treating original design flows. Removal of an average of 4 inches of sludge in the primary pond would increase the capacity of the primary pond by approximately 1 million gallons. Removal of an average of 6 inches of sludge in the secondary ponds would increase the capacity of the secondary pond by approximately 900,000 gallons. A total of 1,900,000 gallons, based on the 105,600 gallons per day design flow equates to approximately 18 days of flow. Removal of accumulated sludge would return the pond bottom to the original pond bottom and reduce the likelihood that suspended solids are released during a control discharge. Removal of accumulated sludge is an immediate need to allow continued operation of the facility.

Lift Stations

Improvements to the main lift station would consist of new pumps and controls.

Improvements to the individual grinder pump stations are not necessary at this time. It is recommended that the City continue to have on hand at a minimum, one replacement pump at all times to allow replacing or repairing a failed pump if necessary. The City should plan for future budgeting to replace controls and other components within the next 10 years.

Capacity

A review of the wastewater flows to the treatment facility does not indicate there is a need for additional capacity. Further review of the flow data indicates a need to investigate the cause of the extreme peak flow days and months. Some potential causes of these extreme flow days and months would be related to inflow and infiltration.

Wastewater Collection System Improvements

Inflow/Infiltration Assessment Plan

Reviewing the wastewater collection system conditions, treatment system conditions and the

wastewater flow data indicates a need to reduce the peak flow events that occur. Development of an Inflow and Infiltration Assessment Plan could reveal causes of inflow and infiltration that have not been identified.

Manhole Improvement

Preliminary discussions with City staff have indicated that there are existing sanitary manholes that allow stormwater inflow into the collection system. At this time, it is estimated that 10 sanitary manholes are in need of immediate improvements to reduce the inflow of stormwater into the system.

Project Timeline

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Acceptance of Facility Plan | September 2019 |
| Prepare Plans and Specifications | October 2019 – December 2019 |
| Submit Plans and Specifications for Regulatory Review | January 2020 |
| Secure Funding/Financing | April 2020 |
| Bid and Award Construction Contract | May 2020 |
| Begin Construction | June 2020 |
| Complete Construction | May 2021 |

Other Considerations

None

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NA

Who will own the facility?

City of Floodwood

Who will operate the facility?

City of Floodwood

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Floodwood

Public Purpose

Wastewater collection and Treatment for the City of Floodwood.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Jess Rich
Administrator
218-476-2751
admin@ci.floodwood.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water

infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$8 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$67 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$89 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$836 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Foley Wastewater Regionalization | 1 | GO | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Foley Wastewater Regionalization

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$10,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$10 million in state funds is requested to pay an estimated \$6-\$9 million dollar connection fee to the City of St. Cloud and make \$13.4 million dollars in wastewater improvements, which includes construction of an 11 mile force main to provide sewer treatment for the City of Foley. Total project costs are estimated at \$22.4 million. |

Project Description

This project contains decommissioning and dredging of existing wastewater ponds, the construction of a new (approximately 11 mile) force main and installation of pumps. A significant portion of the costs (\$6-\$9 million) also come from a one-time connection fee to buy-in to the St. Cloud wastewater system. A breakdown of project costs is below.

The project is the preferred alternative of the City after studying numerous options as part of a facility plan. Foley's close proximity to the City of St. Cloud and a potential future sulfate limit with on-site treatment are the main driving factors in pursuing the regionalization alternative. The City of Foley has been in discussions with the City of St. Cloud on this alternative for over a year.

The estimated design process would begin in September of 2019. Bidding would occur in July of 2020 with construction starting in the fall of 2020. An estimated completion date is November of 2021.

Overview of Costs:

Existing Ponds Decommissioning & Dredging: \$617,246

Lift Station Improvements: \$146,898

Pumps Along Force Main: \$1,608,000

Force Main & Appurtenances: \$5,004,700

Chemical Feed Systems: \$278,445

Permitting & ROW Acquisition: \$225,000

Site Work: \$178,000

Electrical/Mechanical: \$164,489

One-time Connection Fee: \$6,000,000-\$9,000,000

Contingency: \$2,467,000

Engineering: \$1,645,000

Legal & Admin: \$412,000

Material Testing: \$247,000

Mobilization: \$412,000

Total: \$19.4 - \$22.4 million

Funding at the state level is crucial to move forward with this project and ensure the future of the community of Foley. With an existing high tax rate, additional debt is a concern of elected officials. Preliminary estimates show Foley is not eligible for grant funds in the Water Infrastructure Fund (WIF) or a Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG). If no state funding were to be obtained and debt service were to be issued for the entire amount, the sewer rates are estimated to increase approximately 300%.

The City of Foley is currently at capacity and not allowed sewer extensions until this project is

completed. This eliminates our ability to grow and sustain our current community.

Project Rationale

The City of Foley is out of capacity in their existing wastewater treatment ponds. In order to grow and sustain existing residential units and industry in town a significant expansion needs to occur. Foley is in a unique position as it is subject to a potential sulfate limit as it discharges to Rice Lake, a wild rice water. The need to treat a future sulfate limit is extremely costly which could be devastating to the local economy. Foley recognizes its close proximity to the City of St. Cloud and a technologically advanced wastewater treatment facility and desires instead to construct an 11 mile long forcemain along the Highway 23 corridor and connect to the City of St. Cloud's treatment facility. St. Cloud currently has available capacity and is open to this project. However, the one-time connection costs of \$6-\$9 million makes the project costs between \$19.4 and \$22.4 million. Both the City of St. Cloud and City of Foley recognize the value of a long-term solution to wastewater treatment and promote one regionalized wastewater plant servicing numerous communities. State funds to close the gap would make this project possible ensuring Foley's wastewater capacity needs are met, water quality standards are improved and wastewater is treated in the most cost-effective manner. The City of St. Cloud also benefits in being able to utilize available capacity of the plant.

Project Timeline

April 2, 2019 - Foley City Council approves Facility Plan. The preferred alternative of the Facility Plan is regionalization with the City of St. Cloud. The Facility Plan is submitted to the MPCA.

June 2019 - Foley requests placement on the 2020 IUP (Intended Use Plan).

July-August 2019 - City of St. Cloud provides Foley with a final connection fee amount.

September 2019 - Foley City Council authorizes design work.

March 2020 - Plans and specs for the project are submitted to the MPCA.

June 2020 - Plans and specs approval received from MPCA.

July 2020 - Bid project

September 2020 - Start Construction

November 2021 - Complete Construction

Other Considerations

Foley is also home to a significant wet industry, PouchTec Industries. PouchTec currently employees over 200 people. Foley cannot take all of PouchTec's wastewater currently and the company desires to grow in the future which could add up to another 100 jobs. As a current significant employer with a desire to add jobs, Foley needs to develop a wastewater solution capable of handling their needs for the long-term.

Housing is another area of concern for the City of Foley. Since no sewer extensions are allowed the City only has approximately 7 single family lots available for building new construction homes. Other expansion projects have been put on hold until the sewer capacity issue is resolved. This includes additional multi-family and single family construction as well development of the Highway 23 corridor. This also is a concern for our school system since they have room to grow but limited housing is available.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Foley will own approximately 11 miles of force main with pumps until it reaches the City of St. Cloud

wastewater infrastructure. St. Cloud will own and operate all wastewater infrastructure from the connection point on the east end of their city limits up to and including the wastewater treatment facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Foley will operate the approximate 11 miles of force main and pumps. St. Cloud will operate their own infrastructure once it reaches the connection point and up through the processing at the wastewater treatment facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Foley will occupy 11 miles of force main and pumps. The project is being planned to accommodate for future growth and also includes the ability to use an existing stabilization pond as pre-treatment prior to being sent through the force main.

Public Purpose

The wastewater force main and pumps are in place to serve the residents and business members of the City of Foley. St. Cloud will maintain ownership of their wastewater infrastructure and processing plant.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Sarah A. Brunn
City Administrator
320-968-7260
sbrunn@ci.foley.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Foley Wastewater Regionalization

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$12,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$22,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$9,225 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$2,057 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$11,118 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$22,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Highway 97 and Goodview Avenue Intersection Pedestrian Overpass | 1 | GO | 3,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Shore Trail and Pedestrian Improvements | 2 | GO | 2,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wastewater Infrastructure System Replacement and Repair | 3 | GO | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 7,450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 7,450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Highway 97 and Goodview Avenue Intersection Pedestrian Overpass

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$3,200

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$3,200,000 in Capital Budget funds is requested for the design, engineering, and construction of a grade-separated pedestrian bridge over the intersection of Hwy. 97 and Goodview Avenue along with trails that approach the bridge. The bridge will provide pedestrian improvements and safety at a dangerous intersection.

Project Description

Hwy. 97, a state Trunk Highway, serves a regional transportation need for the City, Washington County, and western Wisconsin residents, carrying over 18,000 vehicles per day. Adjacent to the public and private schools attended by over 4,000 students, the vehicle mix at the Hwy. 97 / Goodview Avenue intersection includes 350 buses and walking students during the peak school arrival and departure times. The safety issue involving traffic volume and mix of traveling vehicles and pedestrians is exacerbated by the severely skewed intersecting roadways which limit sightlines. These unsafe conditions have produced one fatality and several crashes.

The City proposes a pedestrian overpass to remedy this issue. The 14-foot wide pedestrian bridge with 10-foot wide approaching trails will also add a connection to the nearby 34-mile Hardwood Creek Regional Trail.

The Hwy. 97 / Goodview intersection is the subject of a 2020 MN DOT reconstruction project to transform the signalized intersection into a roundabout. The design of the roundabout will lead to slower vehicle speeds and reduced crash potential. However, it does not resolve inevitable conflicts between turning vehicles and walking students. The roundabout, in final design phase, is being designed to accommodate an ADA-compliant pedestrian bridge for a grade-separated crossing.

MN DOT, recognizing that this segment of state highway produces an inordinate number of crashes, has conducted an access management study that produced preliminary recommendations to close four local access points, re-align the roadway in several locations and introduce several turn lanes.

Project Rationale

The Hwy. 97/Goodview Ave intersection has several challenges for pedestrians and bicyclists: long crossing distance (120' to 135'), high speed traffic, severely skewed intersecting roadways that limit driver sight lines, and distracted drivers who fail to yield to pedestrians in the marked crosswalk. The conditions results in an unsafe environment for students. There have been three bicycle and two pedestrian crashes at this intersection since 2013, including one fatal crash and one possible injury crash. The proposed project would provide a grade-separated crossing of Hwy. 97, paired with a separately funded roundabout, allowing students as well as recreational pedestrian and bicycle traffic to cross this high speed and heavily traveled highway without motor vehicle conflicts.

Project Timeline

2020-2021: Project Design, Writing Project Specifications, Permitting, Contract Letting
2021- 2022: Construction

Other Considerations

A community of 20,000 residents, the City of Forest Lake has borne the burden of contributing \$2.2 million to upgrade this intersection to a roundabout to improve vehicle safety at this intersection that serves regional traffic. However, the roundabout will not significantly improve the safety needs for children traveling to and from nearby schools. Capital Budget funds will fill this gap to allow construction of the pedestrian bridge to keep local children safe.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

From its General Fund the City would contribute \$46,000 annually to account for maintenance and bridge replacement (\$3,000 annual maintenance, plus \$43,000 annual commitment for bridge replacement after 75 years).

Who will own the facility?

Although the structure and connecting bridge approaches will be within MN DOT right-of-way, the City will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Forest Lake will operate and maintain the pedestrian bridge and connecting trails.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The pedestrian bridge will be used by students arriving to and departing from school, as well as neighborhood residents and children who seek a safer crossing of Highway 97.

Public Purpose

- Improves pedestrian safety at an intersection serving regional traffic.
- Addresses many deficiencies and safety issues in an area serving several school facilities
- ADA compliance
- Direct connection to designated RBTN Tier 1 Alignment and Hardwood Creek Regional Trail
- Integrates and extends existing and planned infrastructure
- Reduces conflict points and crash potential at a key intersection

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous State appropriations for this project. However, the proposed project has a direct connection, in the form of needed safety improvements, to the adjoining Hwy. 97/ Goodview roundabout project in which MN DOT has committed \$1,695,000 to construct. The City has committed \$2,200,000 to this independently-funded project.

Project Contact Person

Donovan Hart
Zoning Administrator
651-209-9734
donovan.hart@ci.forest-lake.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

Highway 97 and Goodview Avenue Intersection Pedestrian Overpass

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,200 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$260 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$60 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,880 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,200 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | No |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

North Shore Trail and Pedestrian Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,250

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: \$2,250,000 in Capital Budget funds is requested for the design, engineering, and reconstruction of North Shore Trail along with an additional 10' wide pedestrian and bicyclist trail from Greenway Avenue to Kulencamp Park at 230th Street. The length of the road and trail corridor is approximately 2.5 miles.

Project Description

North Shore Trail in Forest Lake is the primary “ring road” for the city’s namesake lake. For decades a County road, the City took possession of the road in 2011, which is two lanes of black top. The road lacks many modern safety features and any recreational or safety features for non-vehicular traffic. With an estimated \$4,500,000 construction cost, the City is requesting the State’s assistance in remedying this situation to reconstruct the road and supplement the roadway with a trail to increase pedestrian safety, expand the local transportation network, and provide a greater range of recreational opportunities in order to increase community health.

The 2.5-mile long trail project would include about 52,800 square feet of new 10-foot wide bituminous trail. The sub-base, surface, and striping would meet state aid standards for a trail. The City would assume year-round maintenance of the trail, including snow plowing in the winter.

The proposed trail would provide access to one of the City’s signature parks. Also, based on the trail’s adjacency to the City’s northern boundary line, it would serve as a bicycle/pedestrian conduit for both Forest Lake and City of Wyoming residents.

Project Rationale

Currently North Shore Trail is a two-lane road with road segments that allow speeds up to 40 mph for the daily 5,000 vehicles driven by lakeside dwellers and service trucks. Any pedestrian or bicyclist who braves these conditions is relegated to a gravel shoulder. Recognizing the tight geometry of turns and lack of other safety infrastructure, the City conducted a speed study and reduced speed limits in 2017. However, a permanent solution in the form of reconstructed road with a pedestrian/bicyclist trail is needed.

In addition, the City recently hosted a MN Urban Land Institute developer roundtable to explore the City’s position within the Twin Cities’ emerging development market. One of the key takeaways is that a principle driver for new residents to locate in a new area is the quantity and quality of recreational facilities. Already identified as a key segment in the City’s 2040 Trails plan, this trail would expand the City’s recreational opportunities and alternative transportation network, which currently includes the Hardwood Creek Regional Trail.

Project Timeline

2021-2022: Project Design, Writing Project Specifications, Right-of-Way Acquisition (if necessary), Permitting, Contract Letting

2022-2023: Construction

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City will allocate General Fund money for ongoing maintenance and repair.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Forest Lake.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Forest Lake.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Forest Lake residents walking and biking the trail are expected to be the main beneficiaries of these improvements, with additional use by City of Wyoming residents due to the trail's proximity to their homes. At the eastern end of the trail, Kulencamp Park is a popular local destination for recreational activities.

Public Purpose

- Increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety
- Increase vehicular safety
- Expand the non-motorized transportation network
- Provide alternatives to the personal automobile to decrease greenhouse gas emissions
- Implement the 2040 Trail Plan

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous State appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Donovan Hart
Zoning Administrator
651-209-9734
donovan.hart@ci.forest-lake.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

North Shore Trail and Pedestrian Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$2,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Wastewater Infrastructure System Replacement and Repair**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 3 |
| Project Summary: | \$2,000,000 in Capital Budget funds is requested for the design, engineering, and reconstruction of wastewater infrastructure that includes 10 lift stations and adjoining force mains. |

Project Description

The \$4,000,000 project replaces and repairs aging public sanitary sewer infrastructure. The ten sanitary lift stations in this project to preserve existing infrastructure date back to the 1950s and 1960s. Long overdue for an overhaul, the condition of the pump dry well has deteriorated to the point where a human finger can penetrate the rusted tin shell. In addition, these lift stations have no backup capacity in the event of an electrical power outage, of which there have been four outages this year alone. Public Works must employ pump trucks to prevent sewage backing up into residents' basements.

The new sanitary lift stations will reduce electrical power consumption, eliminate danger of worker electrocutions from stray voltage, and allow for backup generators to run pumps during electrical service interruptions.

The City operates 46 lift stations to serve the sanitary sewer needs of residents and preserve lake water quality of Forest Lake. Recently, the City spent \$4,320,000 on improvement and rehabilitation at 16 lift station sites. With the completion of the proposed Wastewater Infrastructure improvements, all wastewater pumping systems would be updated to infrastructure and equipment constructed in 1995 or newer.

Project Rationale

- All wastewater pumping systems would be updated to infrastructure and equipment constructed in 1995 or newer.
- The needed replacement will allow for efficient repair of facilities with modern readily available parts.
- Reduced energy consumption
- Expedited response in re-establishing and maintaining sanitary sewer service during electrical service interruptions.

Project Timeline

2021-2022: Project Design, Writing Project Specifications, Permitting, Contract Letting

2023: Construction

Other Considerations

Forest Lake is at risk of being an impaired lake. The wastewater infrastructure repair project will ensure that the local sanitary sewer system is not a source of nutrient load into the lake.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City will allocate General Fund money for ongoing maintenance, repair, and replacement.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Forest Lake.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Forest Lake.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The residents, visitors, and businesses of Forest Lake.

Public Purpose

- Serve the public health need to have an adequate sanitary sewer conveyance system
- Bring all sanitary pumping facilities up to having less than 20 years in service.
- Protect environmentally sensitive areas from sanitary sewer discharge
- Support residential development

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous State appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Donovan Hart
Zoning Administrator
651-209-9734
donovan.hart@ci.forest-lake.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Wastewater Infrastructure System Replacement and Repair

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,650 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Trailhead Hub | 1 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Trailhead Hub

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Gilbert is requesting \$1,000,000 in State funds to predesign, design and construct an Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Trailhead Hub as part of the City owned Sherwood Forest Campground. The hub would be a regional benefit to support the Iron Range Off-Highway Vehicle State Recreation Area (IROHVSRA) and would be a centrally located hub to the ATV Trail networks in Northeastern Minnesota.

Project Description

The City of Gilbert currently owns a 57-unit campground, some with full hookup utilities to others as remote tent sites. The campground amenities include horseshoes, volleyball and other activities, plus access to the Mesabi Trail. The campground also includes access to Lake Ore-Be-Gone that has a public boat landing, fishing pier and swimming beach. Lake Ore-Be-Gone has established itself as a well-known scuba diving area, primarily due to the clarity of the water in the abandon mine pit, with sunken buses, jeeps, a helicopter and other objects for people to explore. Groups as far away as San Diego have made their way to the Sherwood Forest Campground to access the scuba diving. Since the opening of the IROHVSRA, that campground has been near capacity. The project includes the expansion of the existing Sherwood Forest Campground and beach area, that specifically includes:

Project Rationale

The IROHVSRA located in Gilbert is a 1,200-acre site that provides a wide variety of terrain and recreational trail opportunities for all skill levels. The IROHVSRA is expanding the park that includes an additional 2,700 acres of OHV recreational opportunities north of Gilbert. The sites are managed by the MnDNR.

Northeastern Minnesota also includes a number of OHV/ATV trail system that provides trail riding opportunities that includes:

The number of trails in the area will continue to grow with a short-term plan that would link the IROHVSRA to this growing trail system and may be used as a launching point for multi-day excursions throughout Northeastern Minnesota.

The expansion of the Sherwood Forest Campground will support the growth of the OHV/ATV recreational activities and provide and economic benefit to the local businesses in the area.

Project Timeline

planning/design summer 2020

project bidding fall 2020

initiate construction fall 2020

complete construction fall 2021

Other Considerations

The project is a regional collaboration working with the MN DNR, local trail groups and other government agencies to promote the economic and recreational benefit to the area.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The requested amount is \$1,000,000.

Who will own the facility?

City of Gilbert

Who will operate the facility?

City of Gilbert

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Users of the OHV Parks, ATV Trails, general public for camping and beach activities.

Public Purpose

The project is of regional significance providing and supporting the recreational activities of both motorized and non-motorized trail users, along with outdoor activities associated with camping.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jim Paulsen
Executive Administrative Clerk
218-748-2232
clerk@gilbertmn.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Trailhead Hub

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Cannon Valley Trail Storm Water Infrastructure Improvement and Trail Access Facilities Development | 1 | GO | 3,106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Cannon Valley Trail Storm Water Infrastructure Improvement and Trail Access Facilities Development

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$3,106

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$3,106,000 in state funds is requested to design, engineer, and construct storm water infrastructure improvements and trail access facility developments for the Cannon Valley Trail. The funding requested will address significant storm water issues related to inadequate infrastructure including active erosion sites and slope failures; and make major trail head facility improvements involving new modern restrooms, picnic shelter, parking expansion, and signage.

Project Description

The Cannon Valley Trail (CVT) is a 19.7 mile long trail that runs through diverse and spectacular scenery connecting the cities of Cannon Falls, Welch and Red Wing in Goodhue County. The CVT connects to the Goodhue Pioneer State Trail in Red Wing and to the Mill Towns State Trail in Cannon Falls. The trail is open year round for bicycling, in-line skating, skateboarding, hiking, and cross country skiing and serves approximately 100,000 visitors annually. The CVT is governed by a Joint Powers Board (Cities of Cannon Falls and Red Wing; Goodhue County) and is not a Minnesota DNR state trail.

This bonding request involves two major projects: Project #1 – Storm Water Infrastructure Improvement Project; and Project #2 – Trail Access Facility Development. Both of these projects were identified as priorities in the 2017 Cannon Valley Trail Comprehensive Plan Update. One aspect of the Comprehensive Plan focused on the fact that the trail generally occupies the toe of the slopes as it parallels the Cannon River that makes it susceptible to slope erosion and sediment that severely impacts trail use and results in damage to the trail, filling of wetlands, and requires extensive and expensive clean up. The Comprehensive Plan included a detailed engineering analysis of these issues, recommended solutions and established cost estimates.

Project #1 involves addressing storm water infrastructure problems at seventeen locations along the trail. These improvements involve uphill stabilization (105 LF); downhill slope bank armoring to prevent migration of the Cannon River from severing the trail (675 LF); ditch improvements (820 LF); culvert replacement (6); upland ravine storm water management improvements (3.75 Acres); and trail raising/widening/pavement (14,000 LF). Total cost of Project #1 including construction, contingency, engineering and construction management is estimated at \$1,897,786.

Project #2 involves addressing key findings from the public engagement process that was a part of the updated Comprehensive Plan by making improvements to three accesses to the trail at the Welch Trail Head, Old West Main Trail Head in Red Wing and the Cannon Bottom Road Access in Red Wing. Improvements required include increased parking capacity, better restrooms, and adding picnic shelters. Specifically, the project includes: Welch Trail Head replacement of the existing pit toilets with

a modern restroom with new showers and new attached picnic shelter (1920 SF); Old West Main Trail Head construction of a new modern restroom with shower (1250 SF), trail realignment to accommodate restroom (375 LF), 8 stall parking lot expansion 2400 SF), existing 35 stall parking lot renovation 10,500 SF), signs, lighting, and benches; and Cannon Bottom Road Access installation of new signs and kiosk improvement. Total cost of Project #2 including construction, contingency, engineering and construction management is estimated at \$1,209,214.

Total estimated cost of Project #1 and Project #2 is \$3,106,000. Goodhue County is requesting this amount in state funding.

Project Rationale

Occupying a former railroad right-of-way the Cannon Valley Trail was once declared one of America's top 11 rail trails by Bicycling magazine. Founded through citizen action, the trail opened in 1986 and now hosts 100,000 annual visitations. A guest book at Welch Station Access recorded visitors in one year from 35 states and 7 countries and it is estimated that 60 percent come from outside of Goodhue County, 5 percent from out of state. The CVT is a vital regional recreational asset that contributes greatly to the economic well-being of Minnesota and Goodhue County.

Trail management is unique as it is governed by a local joint Powers Board because it passes through a Wild and Scenic river designation and state ownership and operations were not allowed. The CVT enjoyed early success as annual visitations grew quickly from an estimated 20,000 in 1986 to 75,000 in 1992 and 100,000 today. In addition to annual operating funding from the three units of government, in 1991 the Joint Powers Board decided to implement a mandatory wheel pass, for those age 16 and older (later changed to 18 and older). The purpose of the wheel pass was to provide an additional funding base for capital improvements (especially asphalt overlays). For over 30 years the Joint Powers Board has been able to manage and maintain one of Minnesota's finest recreational facilities.

In 2017, the Joint Powers Board approved a Comprehensive Plan Update that took a deep look at infrastructure conditions, assessment of needs from users and stakeholders, and specific management and improvements needed maintain the recreational asset over the next twenty years. This plan identified the need to address major infrastructure needs in order to ensure the ability to provide one of Minnesota's leading recreational resources for the next generation. Capital investments over the next five to ten years are needed in several priority areas including the need to completely replace most of the existing 8 foot wide trail to meet today's 10 foot wide trail standard; the need to replace all but one of the nineteen bridges; the need to address significant storm water erosion issues at seventeen locations; and the need to provide modern restroom facilities at the major trail head accesses that currently lack those facilities.

The funding strategy developed by the Joint Powers Board to address these major infrastructure investment priorities is as follows:

- Application to the Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Commission and was successful in meeting their requirements to be designated a trail of regional importance in 2015.
- Completion of the required Comprehensive Plan Update in 2017.
- The Joint Powers Board intends to focus Legacy Parks and Trail funding applications for the bituminous pavement and bridge replacement projects. An initial Legacy Grant was approved in 2018 to replace three bridges in the poorest condition.
- The 2017 Comprehensive Plan included user surveys and analysis that concluded that the current \$25 annual wheel pass and \$5 daily pass were priced appropriately to net the maximum user fee

revenue. These funds will be used for annual maintenance and a portion to be used for matching funds for Legacy Trail Grants.

- In 2018, the three units of government that make up the Joint Powers Board agreed to increase their contributions with additional support to provide at least a 25 percent match for Legacy Trail Grant applications. Goodhue County - \$100,000, City of Red Wing - \$69,400, City of Cannon Falls - \$34,700.
- Donations: One single donation of \$268,000. One single donation of \$50,000.
- State bonding request to fund infrastructure improvements needed to address storm water erosion issues and trail access facilities.

Project Timeline

2019 – 2020: Execute permanent storm water easements needed to complete storm water management improvements in upland ravines

2020 – 2021: Engineering and design of public infrastructure and facilities

2020 – 2021: Complete Environmental Review Record and local and state permitting

2022 – 2023: Construction of public infrastructure and facilities

Other Considerations

The Cannon Valley Trail is one of the oldest and highest quality rail to trail facilities in the country and has been well managed for over thirty years. However, it is an aging facility and some of the essential elements of the trail are in need of more than just regular maintenance; they need full structural replacement or are outdated. The local units of government that make up the Joint Powers Board have made substantial financial commitments and applied for other trail grants to address these needs including a \$1.4 million project that is currently underway to replace four bridges. But there is more that needs to be done and the local governments are strapped to come up with additional matching funds. With this in mind, we are asking for a state appropriation to help address the significant issues related to the storm water infrastructure and trail access improvements.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Cannon Valley Trail is operated and managed by the Cannon Valley Joint Powers Board and is not a state trail and so the project should have no impact on state operating dollars. The project will reduce operating costs for the Joint Powers Board because it will address erosion and sediment that occurs along the trail that has to be addressed after major storms and floods. We estimate that the operating cost reductions will be in the neighborhood of \$50,000 to \$60,000 over a six year period.

Who will own the facility?

Goodhue County

Who will operate the facility?

Cannon Valley Trail Joint Powers Board

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Cannon Valley Trail Joint Powers Board operates and uses the facility to provide recreational opportunities to the general public. The trail is used for bicycling, walking, in-line skating, cross-country skiing, birding and other nature related activities.

Public Purpose

The project will address infrastructure issues so that the Cannon Valley Trail can continue to provide public educational and recreational services to the region and state. The trail will also continue to be a major regional recreational draw that brings with it a significant economic impact to the state and region.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There has been no previous state appropriations.

Project Contact Person

Scott Arneson
Goodhue County Administrator
507-263-3001
scott.arneson@co.goodhue.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Cannon Valley Trail Storm Water Infrastructure Improvement and Trail Access Facilities Development

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,106 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,106 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$462 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,644 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,106 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Itasca Recreation Association (IRA) Civic Center | 1 | GO | 5,488 | 0 | 0 | 5,488 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,488 | 0 | 0 | 5,488 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,488 | 0 | 0 | 5,488 | 0 | 0 |

Itasca Recreation Association (IRA) Civic Center

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$5,488**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Grand Rapids is requesting \$5,488,000 for the emergency replacement of the truss/roof structure, existing ice-making system, and other improvements and betterment's of a capital nature for health, safety, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance.**Project Description**

The IRA Civic Center has an emergency need to replace the roof/truss system on the west venue. Originally constructed in 1962 by a group of volunteers, the wood roof/truss system was designed to carry a load of 20 pounds per square foot (psf). Current building code requires 46 psf.

The wood in the truss system has degraded over the past 57 years resulting in two web member failures. Jon Aamodt, a professional structural engineer employed by Northland Consulting Engineers has analyzed the truss system and concluded:

- *The severe under-capacity of the 1962 roof trusses is a dangerous condition and should be corrected.*
- *Signage should be considered to warn the public and employees of the significant under-capacity of the roof structure for snow loading.*
- *In our professional opinion the West facility should not be used in the winter months unless/until the building official, building ownership and other parties agree on temporary measures to protect the public and adjacent structures.*
- *The venue should be closed during a significant snow event, with the understanding that a partial failure has occurred with less than 6 inches of snow on the roof.*

In addition to the roof/truss failure, the refrigeration system, constructed in 1967 uses R-22 Freon, which under Federal EPA law can no longer be produced or imported as of 2020. The 52-year old piping in the floor contains slow leaks and could pose a complete shut-down of the venue if the situation worsens. It is also difficult to replace the roof/truss system without further damaging the tubing and floor with the weight of the crane to remove and replace the new truss/roof system.

As a result of these improvements the 2015 MN Accessibility Code, Chapter 11, requires that 20% of the building renovation cost be dedicated to bringing the building into compliance. The West venue is not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. An elevator needs to be installed and all restrooms and locker room facilities need to come into compliance.

Finally, health and safety needs will be addressed. The HVAC system is 39 years old and has reached the end of its life-cycle. This results in air quality and energy efficiency issues. The existing locker rooms share bathrooms and showers. This makes it difficult to schedule use of the locker rooms with boys and girls hockey. In addition, the West venue does not contain fire suppression.

The total project cost is \$10,976,517. The City Council of Grand Rapids has committed to the local match by resolution.

Project Rationale

The IRA Civic Center is a regional facility owned by the City serving over 200,000 visitors per year. In addition, the facility also serves as one of Itasca County's emergency shelters.

The University of Minnesota estimates that the economic impact of the IRA Civic Center exceeds \$5 million annually. This impact is derived from visitors who live more than 60 miles from the City of Grand Rapids. A majority of the impact occurs in the winter between the months of November and April. Without the IRA Civic Center and its activities the City and region would lose a majority of our hotels and restaurants who are sustained by the facility during the long winters.

Project Timeline

It is absolutely critical that the IRA Civic Center project be executed in a planned process that will take 412 days. Under a planned project process key winter time use in the West Venue will not be interrupted, keeping our hotels and restaurants busy and viable. If the roof/ truss system failed in an unplanned event, the City would lose at a minimum two winters of positive economic impact with the West Venue closed while funding, design, and construction occurred. It's also critical to mention that we do not want to jeopardize the public's safety.

So under a planned project, the following schedule would be recognized:

July 1, 2020, Begin Design

Nov. 4, 2020, Bid Project

Dec. 9, 2020, Award Bids

March 31, 2021, Begin Construction

Nov. 24, 2021, Complete Construction

Dec. 1, 2021, Receive Certificate of Occupancy

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The IRA Civic Center does not operate on State Operating Subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Grand Rapids.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Grand Rapids.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The IRA Civic Center accommodates over 200,000 visitors per year. During the winter months the primary users are the Grand Rapids High School, Grand Rapids Amateur Hockey Association, and the Start of the North Figure Skating Club. During non-winter months the facility hosts over 40 dry floor events and serves as the communities emergency shelter.

Public Purpose

The IRA Civic Center serves as an emergency shelter, election polling place, services large school

functions such as graduation, prom, kindergarten roundup, along with spring and fall sports during inclement weather. In addition, it is home to public school boys and girls hockey.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Tom Pagel
City Administrator
218-326-7626
tpagel@ci.grand-rapids.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$5.488 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Itasca Recreation Association (IRA) Civic Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,488 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$5,489 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,977 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$617 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$51 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,981 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$99 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$229 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,977 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Hastings Historic Courthouse | 1 | GO | 2,027 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Highway 316 Improvements | 2 | THB | 2,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,427 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,027 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 2,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Hastings Historic Courthouse

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,027

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The historic Dakota County Courthouse, finished in 1871, is the second oldest courthouse in the state and oldest building used for municipal service since being converted to Hastings City Hall in 1993. The City of Hastings has made a great investment in the building over the past 26 years with the original rehabilitation, several minor rehab projects, and regular maintenance. The city now faces a major, once in a lifetime, roof replacement with this project to this important landmark building.

Project Description

The center dormer and corner tower roofs are covered with unusual metal panels dating back to the 1912 dome replacement. These panels along with other decorative metal details are well over 100 years old. They have reached the end of their life span and are rusting from the inside out. The metal panels are installed over an organic underlayment as the final barrier against water infiltration. This underlayment has broken down from age and no longer provides adequate protection from water that gets past the leaking panels. There are currently intermittent leaks that occur during large rainstorms. These leaks further degrade the underlayment and have caused damage to the building's original plaster. The leaks cannot be easily repaired because the movement of water through the different layers. The dome and tower roofs are also highly difficult to access and since the roof is past its lifespan, patching would only be a temporary solution. New galvanized metal panels and decorative details must be recreated and installed over a new modern underlayment. The portion of this project being funded by the city of Hastings, along with grants, is the extensive masonry restoration and complete redesign and replacement of the heating ventilation and cooling system, which will improve air quality, high humidity, and make energy improvements.

Project Rationale

The roof has lasted over 100 years, which is a testament to the design and craftsmanship that went into this building. Despite past efforts to maintain this roof by performing regular joint sealing and painting, the roof has reached the end of its useful life. The roof of this iconic building is the most important protection against water infiltration, in addition to one of its most distinguishing features. The rehabilitation must be completed in compliance with strict historical design guidelines and should easily last over 100 years once again.

The cost to perform this necessary work could pay for a modest office building to house the current city hall staff. However, doing so would jeopardize this great Minnesota landmark building. The City of Hastings has made a commitment to its preservation.

Project Timeline

As soon as the funding for the project is in place, a historical architecture firm will be contracted to develop a predesign and architectural plans for the project based directly on the existing design. This

may include some improvements based on new technology and materials that do not affect the appearance. These plans will then be included in a bid request package to secure a qualified firm to perform the work for a competitive price. A successful bidder will be reviewed for determination of qualifications. Lastly, a selected firm will order the materials and perform the work.

- Development architectural plans and bid specifications – February & March, 2 months
- Solicitation of bids - April - 1 month
- Selection process - May - 3 weeks
- Mobilization and procurement of materials – June & July- 2 months
- Construction – August & September - 2 months

Other Considerations

The City of Hastings has begun other rehabilitation work to the building. This includes HVAC replacement and upgrades to improve air quality and high humidity, which has caused air quality issues, destroyed records, and degraded building materials and historical resources. Additionally, a major masonry rehabilitation is addressing failing and leaking masonry. Completing the roofing rehabilitation is imperative for the protection of the building, but is the most costly portion of the project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No impact on the state operating budget is anticipated, aside from possible opportunities to apply for grants through the Minnesota Historical Society for preservation projects.

Who will own the facility?

City of Hastings

Who will operate the facility?

City of Hastings

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Hastings staff and public officials, citizens, tourists, meeting attendees from citizen groups, nonprofits, businesses, and local and state agencies.

Public Purpose

The public purpose of this projects is to maintain this Minnesota landmark. Its history is tied to the states beginnings by multiple connections. Several Hastings founders and city leaders were instrumental in the construction and use of this building and went on to hold a variety of state offices. One of Minnesota’s first architects, A.M. Radcliff, designed the building and hired a 17 year old apprentice, Cass Gilbert, who went on to design the State Capitol building. President Rutherford B. Hayes held a grand reception and speech at the courthouse in 1878. Currently used as the City of Hastings municipal building, it is open to the public for photography, tours, and weddings, It houses a local historical archive and an extensive art display lines the great halls exhibiting a wide variety of Minnesota subjects and artists. The five public meeting rooms are used by citizen groups, musicians, businesses, nonprofits, county and state agencies at little to no cost.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$212,187 was graciously granted by the Minnesota Historical Society to assist with the masonry portion of the project. This State Capital Projects Grants-in-Aid was awarded in March of 2018.

Project Contact Person

Justin J Fortney
City Planner
651-480-2381
jfortney@hastingsmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Hastings Historic Courthouse

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,027 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$212 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$236 | \$424 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$1,702 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$448 | \$4,153 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$80 | \$540 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$298 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$368 | \$3,298 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$17 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$448 | \$4,153 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Highway 316 Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,400

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: The Highway 316 Improvements project, scheduled for construction in 2021, will reconstruct and reconfigure a one-mile stretch of regionally significant principal arterial highway through the City of Hastings, significantly improving highway safety for all users by reducing access delays for motorist, increasing access and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, providing traffic calming, and enhancing growth and development opportunities within the City of Hastings and nearby areas.

Project Description

This project will incorporate a variety of physical modifications to a one-mile segment of Trunk Highway 316 through the City of Hastings, reconfiguring the roadway to feature:

- **Three new compact (mini) roundabouts.** These will improve access to and from local streets as well as enhance safety along the corridor by reducing points of conflict at intersections and calming traffic speeds. Traffic is projected to grow, and the existing situation already produces unacceptable delays to access Highway 316 during peak periods. This project seeks to reduce access delays, and thereby reduce risk-taking by motorists who attempt to avoid waiting. Additionally, with prevailing speeds of 10-12 MPH above posted limits, traffic calming has been a highly desired outcome of the project and the roundabouts will produce maneuvering that calms traffic and slows speeds through the corridor.
- **An urban design with a new center median.** This will aid in traffic calming by helping create an environment more conducive to slower speeds, and it will minimize risky left turn activity, thereby improving safety and mobility along the corridor. Data indicates above average and/or higher than critical crash rates throughout the corridor and with 30% of crashes being right angle, elimination of left turns is critical to long-term safety.
- **Extensions of new trails alongside TH 316.** This will provide a separated facility for pedestrian and bicycle users and for the corridor to offer complete-streets functionality on this portion of the Mississippi River Trail route where there are currently very few bike/pedestrian facilities available.
- **Enhanced and Safer pedestrian crossing facilities.** These will connect these users between key places of recreation, commerce, and residence. The corridor currently does not feature any enhanced crossing locations, yet field observations show a clear demand by pedestrians and bicyclists to use the corridor for travel and access.

Project Rationale

This project's scope was developed by a partnership between MnDOT and the City of Hastings. Features of the scope were conceptualized and designed after holding a public engagement period in 2018, and directly address four areas of concern most often mentioned by the public.

- Access
- Safety
- Pedestrian & Bicycle Accommodations (lack of)
- Speeding

Project Timeline

This project is currently in final design phase, and a contract bid is scheduled to be let by MnDOT in February of 2021, with construction beginning in early to mid summer of 2021 and being completed by late fall 2021.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

With this project being the reconstruction of an existing Trunk Highway facility, this roadway will continue to be owned and operated by the State of MN and operations and maintenance are not anticipated to change significantly.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT will continue to own and operate the Trunk Highway facility.

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT will continue to operate the Trunk Highway road facility, and the City of Hastings will have maintenance and upkeep responsibility for certain elements adjacent to and beneath the Trunk Highway, such as bicycle and pedestrian trails, municipal utilities, and local street approaches which intersect the Trunk Highway.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The traveling public will use the facility using multiple modes (motor vehicle, bicycle, walking, etc.)

Public Purpose

The features in the planned scope of the project were direct result of many months of public engagement and were crafted specifically to provide benefit to the traveling public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Current funding available for this project through MnDOT's construction budget is inadequate for the entirety of the scope to be completed. Currently, \$3.2 Million of the \$5.6 Million estimated project costs is available through MnDOT construction accounts and the City of Hastings' required local share of construction costs (in accordance with MnDOT cost-sharing policy). A \$2.4 Million funding gap exists.

Project Contact Person

Nick Egger
Public Works Director
651-480-2370
nickegger@hastingsmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Highway 316 Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$2,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$2,590 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$610 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$87 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$890 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,623 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Henderson Area Minnesota River Scenic Byway Highway Minnesota State Highway 93 Historic Flood 10 Ton Road Raise Project | 1 | GO | 16,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 16,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 16,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Henderson Area Minnesota River Scenic Byway Highway Minnesota State Highway 93 Historic Flood 10 Ton Road Raise Project

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$16,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Raise Scenic Byway MN. State Highway 93 above flood elevation for approximately 3.25 miles; also a small bridge structure spanning Rush River will be reconstructed. The increased roadway elevation will range approximately between 6'-8' higher than the existing roadway. An additional 25 acres of right-of-way would need to be acquired to accommodate the improvements. The levee on the south of Henderson city limits would need to be modified to continue 100-year flood protection for the community.

Project Description

Minnesota State Highway 93 provides a direct connection from the City of Henderson to the south to access US Highway 169; it has an approximate flood closure at a river elevation of 733.7'.

This proposed project would raise the existing roadway above the flood elevation for approximately 3.25 miles; there is a small bridge structure spanning the Rush River that will also be reconstructed under this alternative. The increased roadway elevation will range approximately between 6' and 8' higher than the existing roadway. An additional 25 acres of right-of-way would need to be acquired to accommodate the proposed improvements. SEH an engineering firm hired by the Minnesota Department of Transportation put together a preliminary plan to do this as one of the alternatives to help solve flood mitigation issues in 2017. The 3 alternative solutions laid out in the plan were reviewed over the next 2 years and in June of 2019 after consulting with the Minnesota Department of Transportation the Henderson City Council selected the Minnesota River Scenic Byway Minnesota State Highway 93 option as the most optimum solution.

In addition to the road raise the City of Henderson will also need to make modification to its levee system in order to ensure 100 year flood protections for the community. This modification has been included as part of the request and will be done in consultation with the US Army Corps of Engineers.

Project Rationale

Flooding in the Minnesota River Valley has created traffic and mobility challenges for the City of Henderson and MnDOT for decades. The roadways leading into and out of the City of Henderson (Highways 19 and 93 (Minnesota River Scenic Byway) and County Road 6) have been hit especially hard in recent years, with closures due to flooding reaching an all-time high. During seasonal flooding events, residents and commuters traveling through the area have to resort to detours that take them miles out of their way, costing both time and money. The lengthy detours and restricted access to the Henderson Area can substantially impact local businesses and regional traffic. As noted in the 2016 Henderson Comprehensive Plan, "every spring when the annual flooding of the Minnesota River begins, and every time a large rain storm is predicted in the summer, the level of concern rises with

the water levels as townspeople ask themselves if this will be the next time that the roads into town are flooded or washed-out again and the community becomes stranded with only oneway out.”

Per the 2017 study when Highways 19, 93 and County Road 6 are all closed due to flooding along the Minnesota River, the value of the additional time and miles traveled (using MnDOT’s Collar County Travel Demand Model) is calculated to have a daily cost of closure of \$87,000 per day (2017 dollars). During the 2019 flooding road closure season alone this cost was estimated at over \$5 million by local officials.

After studying the alternatives laid out in the 2017 Minnesota Department of Transportation plan the Henderson City Council at its June meeting based on providing area wide flood mitigation, a 10 Ton road and traffic corridor access for both east and west and north and south commerce, continued access of emergency services during all times and seasons and easing the burden of transporting students in and out of the school district and community voted to back the Highway 93 solution to mitigate this issue in cooperation with MNDOT.

Project Timeline

July -October 2020 the City of Henderson begins work with the Minnesota Department of Transportation, Corps of Engineers, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Le Sueur Henderson School District, Sibley County, Henderson Township, local businesses, local non profits and other resources in the pre design stage

November 2020-October 2021-pre design complete and construction documents prepared-right of way needs addressed and acquisitions started.

November 2021-March 2022-funds encumbered, lands secured, bids let, contracts awarded

April 2022-projects started

November 2023-projects completed

Other Considerations

Of the alternatives studied Highway 93 reconstruction provides a significant benefit to the roadway and the highest benefit-cost ratio of the three proposed.

It provides for 10 Ton road access in and out of the area at all times of the year and a guaranteed border to border route for commercial, agricultural, recreational and general traffic.

This option substantially benefits logistics and transportation costs for the Le Sueur Henderson School District.

Access for Henderson Township residents along the route will be greatly improved.

Minnesota Department of Transportation detour routes and signing costs will be substantially less.

The solution will provides for updated security protection for residents of the City of Henderson with an enhanced certified levee.

Provides for recreational and tourism opportunities along the federally designated Minnesota River Scenic Byway Route.

Substantially enhances availability of emergency service access during flood events.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NA

Who will own the facility?

Minnesota Department of Transportation on State Highway 93 and City of Henderson at the levee entrance

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Department of Transportation on State Highway 93 and the City of Henderson at the levee entrance.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Highway 93 is used by commuters, travelers, tourists, business owners, residents, public safety agencies, freight operators, parents and students, etc. who depend on a safe, congestion free point to point transportation route.

The business owners and residents of the City of Henderson depend on a certified levee which protects their property and keeps them safe from flooding events and natural disasters.

Public Purpose

Raise a well traveled State Highway in District 7 of the Minnesota Department of Transportation and maintain flood protection for residents and businesses of the City of Henderson, Minnesota

Description of Previous Appropriations

Funding to study potential solutions in 2016 and 2017 done by the Minnesota Department of Transportation Hydrology Department and for flood mitigation options by District 7 of the Minnesota Department of Transportation.

Project Contact Person

Lon Berberich
City Administrator
507-327-0646
lonber3@mchsi.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

**Henderson Area Minnesota River Scenic Byway Highway Minnesota State Highway 93
Historic Flood 10 Ton Road Raise Project**

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$16,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,200 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$25 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,425 | \$3,200 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$2,200 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$13,425 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,425 | \$3,200 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
|---|----|

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Highway 252 Freeway Conversion Between Highway 610 and I-694 | 1 | THB | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Avivo (formerly Resource, Inc.) | 2 | GO | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 51,800 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,800 | 0 | 0 | 1,800 | 0 | 0 |

Highway 252 Freeway Conversion Between Highway 610 and I-694**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$50,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** Convert Highway 252 to a freeway, potentially including MnPASS lanes. Hwy 252 currently has five intersections in the top 100 Statewide Crash Cost Ranking.**Project Description**

Hennepin County, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) and the cities of Brooklyn Center, Brooklyn Park and Minneapolis are developing proposals to address the future of Hwy 252 in Brooklyn Park, Brooklyn Center and northern Minneapolis. Conversion from at-grade intersections to a limited access freeway is being considered for Highway 252.

An environmental review is underway to develop solutions to reduce congestion, improve safety and address reliability on Hwy 252 between Hwy 610 in Brooklyn Park and I-694 in Brooklyn Center. The addition of MnPASS lanes is being considered for both Hwy 252 and I-94. These changes would affect drivers, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists in the area.

Project Rationale

This is a life/safety critical project for the north metro region. Within a distance of 2.6 miles, Hwy 252 currently has five at-grade intersections, all of which are in the top 100 Statewide Crash Cost Ranking (2011-2015):

- #2: At-grade intersection with 66th Avenue in Brooklyn Center
- #9: At-grade intersection with 85th Avenue in Brooklyn Park
- #12: At-grade intersection with 73rd Avenue in Brooklyn Center and Brooklyn Park
- #67: At-grade intersection with Brookdale Drive in Brooklyn Park
- #86: At-grade intersection with Humboldt Avenue in Brooklyn Park

The Highway 252 corridor is identified in the Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study as a high-priority corridor. The Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study identified the high entering volumes at Highway 252 intersections, noting that the existing intersections exceed capacity. Highway 252 corridor carries commuter-oriented traffic from the north and northwest Twin Cities suburbs to employment centers in Minneapolis and surrounding communities, connections to other corridors such as I-94, I-694, Highway 610, and Highway 100, as well as destinations beyond the project area. An origin-destination analysis of trips on Highway 252 using the Metropolitan Council's travel demand model shows that a large percentage (approximately 90 percent) of the traffic on Highway 252 consists of regional trips. This commuter-oriented demand results in peak period traffic patterns on Highway 252 and I-94 predominately southbound in the morning hours and northbound in the afternoon hours. Existing traffic volumes on Highway 252 range from 56,000 vehicles per day at the north end of the corridor near Highway 610 to 67,000 vehicles per day at the south end of the corridor

at I-94/I-694.

The MnPASS System Study Phase 3 included the Highway 252 and I-94 corridors. The analysis reported in the MnPASS System Study Phase 3 noted that the I-94 corridor from Highway 252 to Highway 55 has a high express commuter bus demand and a high degree of connectivity to other MnPASS corridors and major destinations. The Highway 252 corridor was identified to exhibit a higher severity of congestion (as measured by mile-hours of congestion, congestion was defined as speeds below 45 MPH) compared to other corridors considered in the study.

Project Timeline

Other Considerations

Allocated state revenues or bond funds could be granted to either MnDOT or Hennepin County.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation); with approaches and other supporting infrastructure owned by Hennepin County and the cities of Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center.

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT (Minnesota Department of Transportation)

Who will use or occupy the facility?

All residents, visitors and companies within the State of Minnesota will benefit from this improvement.

Public Purpose

- Improves safety and reduces congestion by improving highway access design and capacity.
- Improves mobility and reduces congestion with the addition of MnPass lanes and grade separated access areas (i.e. interchanges).
- Provides smoother ride.
- Improves drainage.
- Extends service life of highway and drainage system.
- Upgrades signals and pedestrian crossings to ADA standards at ramps along Hwy 252.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The Minnesota Department of Transportation, Transportation Advisory Board (TAB), Hennepin County, Brooklyn Park and Brooklyn Center have allocated funds toward the Environmental Review and other preliminary planning efforts.

Project Contact Person

Carla Stueve
Hennepin County Engineer
612-596-0356
Carla.Stueve@hennepin.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Highway 252 Freeway Conversion Between Highway 610 and I-694

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$129,000 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$8,900 | \$0 | \$7,000 |
| City Funds | \$6,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$7,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$41,500 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$13,600 | \$58,900 | \$170,500 | \$7,000 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$37,500 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$1,500 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$12,100 | \$2,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$133,000 | \$7,000 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$13,600 | \$58,900 | \$170,500 | \$7,000 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Avivo (formerly Resource, Inc.)**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,800**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** Avivo (formerly Resource, Inc.) requests \$1.8 million in state funds for pre-design, design services and select demolition; in support of \$20 million in building renovations and additions to Avivo's campus in Minneapolis.**Project Description**

The 2020 request is only for pre-design, design services and select demolition. However, the proposed total project will double the square footage of Avivo's primary campus in Minneapolis (from 37,332 square feet to 75,226 square feet), make necessary energy improvements and environmental updates.

1904 and 1906 Chicago Avenue:

- Property acquisition and site preparation
- Design of new building/addition

1900 Chicago Avenue:

- Replace energy systems and other mechanicals (plumbing).
- Interior redesign and renovation: expand career education classrooms, computer and resource labs.
- Enlarge child development center.
- Update program and administrative staff offices.
- Integrate the Avivo Institute for Career and Technical Education with the expanded facility.

1825 Chicago Avenue: which houses ArtWorks, Avivo's support program for artists living with mental illness and a Hennepin County Community Support Program (CSP):

- Upgrade energy system.
- Replace roof.
- Expand program facilities, add an art gallery space.

Project Rationale

Avivo is a 501C3 nonprofit organization that serves the Twin Cities metro, Princeton, and St. Cloud, helping to improve the quality of life for individuals and families who experience the greatest barriers to employment, education, and wellness. We started more than 55 years ago with vocational rehabilitation services for people with disabilities, and have expanded to include customized employment, career education, and chemical and mental health services, achieving prominence in each field. Avivo serves approximately 19,000 people each year through 48 different programs.

The two buildings at 1825 and 1900 Chicago Ave. house our Chemical and Mental Health programs, Child Development Center, program and administrative staff offices, a Community Support Program (CSP) and ArtWorks for professional artists with a mental illness.

These 1960s era buildings have not had any major renovations. Current problems include:

- A frequently failing original energy system, which is inefficient and will soon no longer be repairable, with parts out of date and unavailable.
- Lack of adequate space: Our chemical and mental health program has grown by 40% over the past 5 years, and we expect to see the same level of growth, resulting in 4,000 more people served.
- Severe interior wear and tear from hundreds of people using the campus every day over 55 years.
- Inadequate reception area for clients.
- Deteriorated parking areas, lack of lighting.

These issues contribute to

- Excessive energy and repair costs, which reduces funds for direct service to clients.
- Inability to serve more recovery clients, despite the great need.
- Overcrowded child learning and play spaces.
- Neighborhood blight.

Project Timeline

Project timeline is dependent upon receipt of state funding.

Other Considerations

Our economic impact is significant:

- 75% of those we serve, living at or below the poverty level, are linked to jobs and recovery.
- 5,000 participants secure jobs each year, with an average wage increase of 60%.
- Every \$1 spend on addiction treatment saves \$7 in social costs.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Hennepin county, with a long term lease and use agreement between Hennepin county and Avivo.

Who will operate the facility?

Avivo

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Avivo

Public Purpose

The public purpose of this facility is to address poverty, addiction and mental health issues for those citizens facing multiple barriers to success. Avivo provides job skills training and support services to move over 3,000 people annually off welfare and into employment; we work with counties and businesses to provide dislocated workers with training and support. Our career education opportunities help individuals with disabilities or other barriers to discover capabilities, gain workplace

skills, and achieve industry-specific credentials.

Avivo provides critical services for the Twin Cities metro and other service areas, particularly in terms of helping people achieve stable employment, housing, and wellness.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Kelly Matter
President and CEO
612-752-8003
kelly.matter@avivomn.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.8 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Avivo (formerly Resource, Inc.)

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Hibbing Mine View "Windows to the World" | 1 | GO | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,500 | 0 | 0 |

Hibbing Mine View "Windows to the World"

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$1,500**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The Hibbing Mine View site is relocating to accommodate future mining at and adjacent to the Hull Rust Mine View. The overlook is above Hibbing Taconite, the mining operation co-owned and managed by Cliffs. It closed September 30, 2016 and the City of Hibbing is working with staff from Hibbing Taconite to relocate the site. The total project cost is in excess of \$3,000,000 with a 2020 capital projects request of \$1,500,000.

Project Description

The new mine view area is called "Windows to the World" and will have concrete box culverts to serve as windows to the 360 degree spectacular views. Guests will see real-time operations of Hibbing Taconite including two story 240 ton production trucks, rotary drills and up to 42 cubic yard shovels. The new viewing area will include walking trails, interpretive signage, multiple viewing points, and a park where families can roam among the mining artifacts.

Project Rationale

During the last four years of operation, the volume of visitors to the Hibbing Mine View has increased by more than 10,000 people. This is a good indication of the economic impact increase with 29,458 visitors in 2016 and a \$5.6 million infusion into the Iron Range economy.

Project Timeline

The project will start in July of 2020 and finish in May of 2021.

Other Considerations

None

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

The City of Hibbing will own the facility and artifacts on the site.

Who will operate the facility?

The Hibbing Tourist Senior Center will operate the new Mine View "Windows to the World" and in the past has operated from mid May through the end of September every year.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

In 2016, 29,458 people visited the prior mine view site, infusing an estimated \$5.6 million into the

region's economy. These visitors came from 76 countries and all 50 American states.

Public Purpose

This site has regional and world wide significance. The mine view is an opportunity to educate regional residents and tourists about the significant impact mining has in our region. Mining plays a huge role in how we live, work and recreate in northeastern Minnesota. The Mine View is one of the region's most popular tourist attractions.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

John Tourville
Economic Developer
218-312-1564
Jtourville@ci.hibbing.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Hibbing Mine View "Windows to the World"

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Hoyt Lakes Ice Arena Refrigeration System Replacement - Bleachers | 1 | GO | 2,239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,239 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Hoyt Lakes Ice Arena Refrigeration System Replacement - Bleachers

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,239

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$2,239,900 in state funds is requested to replace the existing R-22 Refrigeration System at the Hoyt Lakes Ice Arena and to replace old bleachers.

Project Description

The Hoyt Lakes Ice Arena is served by a R-22 based, industrial grade, direct ice system manufactured by Holmsten Ice Rinks. The existing refrigeration system is 35-years old and has well exceeded its useful, expected and safe life of 25 years. The existing ice rink floor is approximately 17 years old and nearing its expected life of 22-25 years. These types of R-22 systems were very common in the 1970s and early 1980s. Although a very efficient system, the direct R-22 system is no longer installed in ice arenas due to many factors including: environmental concerns with the large quantity of refrigerant required to operate the system (5,000-6,000 pounds); the phase-out of R-22 and other synthetic refrigerants due to their harmful effects on the environment; the safety concerns with circulating refrigerant in the arena space; and the higher installation costs. To maximize energy efficiency and eliminate concerns over harming the environment, a new ammonia-based refrigeration system is recommended, which have a long history of success, are very efficient and use a natural refrigerant.

Project Rationale

The existing direct R-22 system is one of the most efficient systems used in the ice rink industry. Unfortunately, new regulations won't allow new systems like this to be installed. Also, R-22 will no longer be manufactured or imported into the United States starting in 2020 due to high ozone depleting potential (ODP). There are many ice rink facilities in the United States and particularly in Minnesota that are currently using ammonia refrigerant: Amsoil Arena and the DECC, Two Harbors, Silver Bay, Virginia, Hibbing, UMD Sports and Health Center, Sanford Center in Bemidji, Burnsville, Brooklyn Park, White Bear Lake, West St. Paul, South St. Paul, TRIA Rink (Minnesota Wild Practice Facility), Plymouth, St. Louis Park, Hutchinson, Alexandria, Cottage Grove, Maple Grove and many others.

Project Timeline

May 2020 - Removal of existing system with new ammonia-based refrigeration system completion by September 1, 2020.

Other Considerations

The City of Hoyt Lakes is also requesting state funds for this project include updating the current bleacher system in the amount of \$125,000.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

City of Hoyt Lakes

Who will operate the facility?

City of Hoyt Lakes

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Hoyt Lakes

Public Purpose

Ice Skating; Youth, High School and various Hockey games.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Rebecca Burich
City Clerk-Treasurer
218-225-2344
rburich@hoytlakes.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Hoyt Lakes Ice Arena Refrigeration System Replacement - Bleachers

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,239 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,239 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$275 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,727 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$125 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$112 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,239 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Campbell and Otter Lakes Restoration | 1 | GO | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Campbell and Otter Lakes Restoration**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$4,500**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: Improvements and betterments of Campbell Lake, Otter Lake, the South Fork of the Crow River and other tributaries to the lakes in order to improve water quality, increase the areas for recreational activities, and restore fish and wildlife habitat. This project includes predesign, design, engineering and construction of capital improvements, including a forebay installation.

Project Description

Primary project aspects are as follows:

- Clean water quality and sediment data collection/analysis
- Crow River and tributary stream stabilization/restoration
- Lakeshore stabilization/restoration
- Crow River forebay BMP installation for sediment collection

Project Rationale

Natural water bodies within the City of Hutchinson have historically been under-utilized due to existing sedimentation levels and limited fish/wildlife habitat issues. Thus, this project would begin to address the current situation in a cost-effective, collaborated effort.

Project Timeline

Upon receiving and dedicating sufficient funding, the project could potentially be constructed in 2021.

Other Considerations

The City of Hutchinson has invested significant resources to improve storm water treatment dynamics (ponding, maintenance, street sweeping, private development standards, etc.) for about 25 years. Also, the City and MnDNR implemented an overflow dam replacement project (new rock spillway) about 15 years ago that significantly improved fish movement/migration to the upstream lakes being improved by this proposed project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Hutchinson

Who will operate the facility?

City of Hutchinson

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public

Public Purpose

Improve water quality and expand upon fish/wildlife habitat while creating recreational opportunities and bettering shoreline aesthetic/erosion dynamics.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Kent Exner
City Engineer
320-583-5663
kexner@ci.hutchinson.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Campbell and Otter Lakes Restoration

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,032 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$468 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | No |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Runway and Taxiway Reconstruction | 1 | GO | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Runway and Taxiway Reconstruction

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$1,500 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$1,500,000 in State funds is requested to upgrade the airport runway and taxiway. |

Project Description

In 2017, the Airport Commission , with the full support of MnDOT Office of Aeronautics and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), embarked on a planning study which evaluated the existing pavement conditions at the airport, and charted the course for a 4-phased expansive pavement reconstruction of its main commercial service runway and parallel taxiway. The study evaluated how to complete the necessary runway improvements while minimizing the economic impacts, and the following proposal was developed. Phase 1 of this proposed project has been completed. The Airport Commission is requesting State Bonding Bill funds to complete Phase 2, 3 and 4. Phase 2 includes reconstruction of the parallel taxiway to runway standards, so it can be used as a temporary runway during subsequent phases of runway reconstruction. This phase also includes relocating the national weather service (NWS) facility and acquiring necessary property to accomplish the plan developed during the planning study. Phase 3 and 4 will consist of reconstruction of the center section and south portion of the main runway. Timing and funding for these phases have not been finalized, but it is expected to be a financial challenge for the local communities. Funding support for Phase 2, 3 and 4 will allow for adequate time and appropriate financial planning for these phases. The runway and parallel taxiway reconstruction will restore the critical airport pavements to excellent condition to allow INL to continue serving the state and its citizens for the next 20-30 years. The FAA and MnDOT are fully supportive of this project and are committed to providing their funds which will cover 97.5% of the total project costs.

Project Rationale

Koochiching County and the City of International Falls jointly own and operate the Falls International Airport. The airport is embarking on a four-year improvement plan of its main Runway (13/31) and taxiway. The present runway and taxiway are 7409 ft. Approximately 900 ft. is fair-good condition with 6500 ft. now 40 years old. We have been patching and filling cracks every year for more than the past two decades.

The bituminous surface is crumbling and in need of replacement. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Office of Aeronautics have approved the project, which will begin this calendar year with 1000 ft. of both the runway and taxiway being rebuilt. The County and City have accepted responsibility for the local share of spending for the 2019 construction project.

Project Timeline

Project Design Development: Currently underway.

Project Bid: 2019 to 2022
Project Award: 2019 to 2022
Project Construction: 2020 to 2023

Other Considerations

Falls International Airport is a regional airport with daily commercial air service to the Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport and one of only four international ports of entry (7 day/week, 24 hours/day service) in Minnesota.

Falls International Airport is a critical piece of infrastructure in our County and City serving the Packaging Corporation of America paper mill, Voyageurs National Park, Rainy River Community College, Rainy Lake and Kabetogama Lake resorts and northern region of Minnesota. The airport serviced over 32,000 commercial passengers and international flights originating in Korea, Middle Eastern, Canadian and European airports in 2018.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City of International Falls, Koochiching County and the Airport Commission will be responsible for all future operational and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

Koochiching County and the City of International Falls

Who will operate the facility?

Falls International Airport Commission

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be used for City and County functions, and by international businesses, commercial airlines, and the general traveling public.

Public Purpose

The residents and businesses of Koochiching County and the traveling public will be served by the airport.

Description of Previous Appropriations

See project funding sources.

Project Contact Person

Robert (Bob) Anderson
Airport Commission Chairman
218-240-4233
boba@ci.international-falls.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Runway and Taxiway Reconstruction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$47,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$49,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$4,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$45,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$49,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| CSAH 55 Highway-rail Grade Separation | 1 | GO | 3,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CSAH 55 Highway-rail Grade Separation**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$3,900**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$3.9 million in state funds is requested for land acquisition, design, and construction that will facilitate the construction of a highway-rail grade separation on County State Aid Highways 55, 5, and 15 for Kandiyohi County on the SW side of the Willmar Industrial Park.**Project Description**

The project is for the construction of a bridge over two BNSF RR tracks, and approximately one mile of construction and reconstruction of roadway to re-establish the local road network for County Roads 55, 5, and 15. This project will: provide a highway-rail grade separation; provide an effective westerly bypass of the City of Willmar; provide good access to the new Willmar Industrial Park; and provide the least confusing route for the traveling public. This is a \$7.8 million dollar project that Kandiyohi County has already invested \$200,000 in preliminary design, land acquisition, and environmental documents for both the roadways and the bridge.

Project Rationale

The City of Willmar is a regional trade center for Kandiyohi County and west central Minnesota. Willmar is connected to the state trunk highway system via US12, US 71, TH 23, and TH 40. This project is needed to re-establish the local road network as result of building the Willmar Rail and Industrial Park Access Project (Willmar Wye). Included in the needs are: to improve traffic flow due to lack of efficient north-south and east-west movements at Willmar; reduce RR freight rail traffic conflicts and delays due to at-grade crossings; enhance motorized and non-motorized user safety at at-grade RR crossings; promote economic development; and enhance quality of life (noise, emissions, safety, traffic delays) within the City of Willmar.

Project Timeline

Final Design - September 2020 thru October 2021

Environmental/Permits - September 2020 thru October 2021

Construction - May to November 2022

This project construction timing will need to be coordinated with the Willmar Rail and Industrial Park Access Project (Willmar Wye) which is being constructed in seasons 2019 thru 2021.

Other Considerations

The project will provide good, safe westerly traffic flow for industrial traffic, as well as provide good access to the Willmar Industrial Park and Willmar Airport. Currently we are seeing an unnecessary number of trucks going through Willmar which pass by schools, churches, and residential areas.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Kandiyohi County

Who will operate the facility?

Kandiyohi County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The general traveling public with special emphasis on economic development and industrial traffic.

Public Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to enhance traffic operations in the Willmar area and facilitate the movement of both north-south as well as east-west freight movement in the Willmar area. Additionally, the project is intended to enhance economic development by creating good freight access to trunk highways and therefore providing a desirable location for manufacturers to locate.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Melvin Odens
Public Works Director
320-235-3266
mel.odens@kcmn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

CSAH 55 Highway-rail Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$3,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$55 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$880 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$6,865 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| CSAH 24 Overpass | 1 | GO | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CSAH 24 Overpass

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$3,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$3 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, design and construct an overpass on CSAH 24 over the CN railroad grade. This project is needed for improved public safety by providing fast, direct and reliable access to emergency responders as there is no other outlet to this roadway.

Project Description

Koochiching County is submitting the County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 24 Bridge Overpass Project for State Bonding consideration. This project is in a rural area near the municipalities of International Falls and Ranier, in Northern Minnesota, along the Canadian border.

The CSAH 24 Bridge Overpass project was developed through collaboration with local, county, and state officials, locally impacted businesses and communities, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Wisconsin Central Limited (WCL), a subsidiary of Canadian National Railway Company.

The CSAH 24 Project delivers improved public safety and accessibility and will support the continued regional economic viability in a rural community located at a major international port of entry. The total cost of the project is \$6.2 Million. The county is seeking \$3 Million in State Bond funding with the county contributing \$1 Million in local, State Aid funds, Federal BUILD grant funding of \$2 million and a \$200,000 funding contribution from CN Railway. The county is committed to this large infrastructure project and will provide a substantial local funding share. This large funding commitment from a small rural county reflects the importance of this necessary investment in the community.

The CSAH 24 Project will have multiple benefits for the local community as well as benefits to the regional and national economies, including:

- Improved public safety – by providing fast, direct, and reliable access to emergency responders

Approximately 26 percent of all freight rail traffic that enters the United States (U.S.) comes through the Ranier Port of Entry (POE) making Ranier the busiest rail POE in the entire United States. The nation’s second and third largest ports combined (Laredo, TX and Port Huron, MI) handle less freight rail traffic than the Ranier POE. As of 2017, approximately 24-26 trains per day and over 600,000 containers per year pass through this area. Since 2011, rail container throughput at this POE has doubled and rail car volumes are projected to continue to increase. Inbound rail car volumes at the Port of Ranier has continued to increase over the past 10 years while volumes at the next four busiest ports of entry have remained stable or risen only marginally. This busy international port services imports originating in Asia which enter Canada at the Port of Prince Rupert, pass through Canada and enter the U.S. at Ranier. This key freight corridor is facilitating trade and commerce at an international level, but the increasing amount of freight that passes through this port is impacting the local community. The CSAH 24 project will be a significant benefit at a key port that supports international

trade and economic competitiveness.

Project Rationale

The CSAH 24 Bridge Overpass will provide access to hundreds of residents that live east of the CN tracks on a no outlet road. The proposed CSAH 24 Bridge Overpass will replace an existing at-grade crossing with a grade-separated crossing over the CN rail line. Any incident blocking access to residents along CSAH 24 will affect the hundreds of relatives, friends, and co-workers of those families living east of the tracks. All emergency services providers such as fire, ambulance, and police are situated in International Falls, west of the CN rail line making access to these residents impossible when the crossing is blocked. During serious medical emergencies, a few minutes of delay can mean the difference between life and death. The county is concerned that growing train delays is putting the public at risk of not receiving medical treatment when it is needed. The CSAH 24 Bridge Overpass will provide the residents of the county reliable access to emergency responders, employment, and services. Numerous emergency services planning exercises conducted in coordination with local emergency responders and U.S. Customs and Border Protection have identified the need for this project.

Trains are typically two miles in length or more and move slowly through the CSAH 24 at-grade crossing due in part to the Customs and Border Protection checkpoint at U.S. border. The existing CSAH 24 grade crossing at the CN rail line is typically **blocked by trains for more than five hours per day**, and for an average of nearly **17 minutes per train**. Approximately **24-26 trains per day** use the CSAH 24 at-grade crossing and the volume of train traffic is expected to increase approximately 30 percent in the next five to ten years.

The frequent crossing blockages to motorists and emergency responders cause significant travel time delays, general inconveniences and negatively impact the overall quality of life for community members residing east of the tracks. More importantly, the county is concerned about the potential for delay for police, fire, ambulance and emergency service vehicles attempting to reach residents living on CSAH 24 east of the tracks. In an emergency, every minute of response time helps reduce the potential for loss of life or property. The proposed CSAH 24 bridge over the CN tracks would provide a needed alternative to the TH 11 bridge, which is the only other bridge over the CN rail line within 20 miles of Ranier.

An additional concern is for potential derailments in the area. Sensitivity of local residents to the potential impacts of train incidents have been heightened in the past few years due to multiple derailments in nearby areas. In 2015 there were two derailments on CN rail lines in close proximity to Ranier and the Ranier Rail Yard.

Project Timeline

Final design will be completed in February of 2020 with bidding in March and April of 2020. Construction to begin in the May and June timeframe of 2020. Embankment construction will occur in 2020 and the actual overpass and road in 2021 with construction ending in 2021.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project has been in the planning process for many years and the County has fund reserves that have been carefully managed to provide the County's share of funding for the project. There are no new or additional state operating dollars that will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

Koochiching County

Who will operate the facility?

Koochiching County will maintain all aspects of the infrastructure during and after construction.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The public.

Public Purpose

Public Safety.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Trent Nicholson
Assistant County Engineer
218-283-1187
trent.nicholson@co.koochiching.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

CSAH 24 Overpass

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,200 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,200 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------------|--------------------------|----------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Ohuta Beach Breakwater | 1 | GO | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 |
| Roschen Park and Boat Ramp Breakwater | 2 | GO | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 |
| Bank Restoration and Stabilization Along Lake Pepin | 3 | GO | 311 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hok-Si-La Park Water and Sewer Extension | 4 | GO | 587 | 0 | 0 | 587 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi Blufflands Trail Engineering Study | 5 | GF | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roschen Park Parking Lot Reconstruction | 6 | GO | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lake City - Sportsmans Club Parking Lot and Waterfront Improvements | 7 | GF | 106 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lake City Government Pier Structural Engineering Study | 8 | GF | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverwalk Trail Extension | 9 | GO | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Recreational and Athletic Facilities near Roschen Park | 10 | GO | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,368 | 96 | 0 | 2,703 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,157 | 96 | 0 | 2,703 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Ohuta Beach Breakwater**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,058**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$1.058 million in State funds is requested to design and construct a new breakwater on Lake Pepin located at Ohuta Beach in Lake City, MN**Project Description**

This project would create a new 280-foot breakwater at Ohuta Beach in Lake City at Ohuta Park to protect the beach from the prevailing winds. It would also provide additional public access to the lake for water-oriented recreation such as fishing or boat tie-up.

Project Rationale

The location of Ohuta Beach leaves it open to damage and debris associated with the prevailing winds across Lake Pepin. There is also limited public access for boat access and fishing at this site. The beach would be protected by the breakwater, which would also provide additional water-oriented recreation access for fishing and boat tie-up for the public users of Lake Pepin.

Project Timeline

Project design would begin 01/2022 with construction occurring in 2024

Other Considerations

Coordination with the MN DNR and Army Corps of Engineers will be required.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

The breakwater would be owned and maintained by the City of Lake City, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City, MN

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The breakwater will be publicly accessible for water-oriented recreation.

Public Purpose

To protect the public beach at Ohuta Park in Lake City, and provide public water access for water-oriented recreation on Lake Pepin.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.058 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ohuta Beach Breakwater

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,116 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$180 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,620 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$316 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,116 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Roschen Park and Boat Ramp Breakwater**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,058**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** \$1.058 million in state funds is requested to design and construct a new breakwater on Lake Pepin located at Roschen Park in Lake City, MN**Project Description**

This project would create a new 280-foot breakwater at Roschen Park in Lake City at the public boat ramp. to protect watercraft from the prevailing winds as they launch. It would also provide additional public access to the lake for water-oriented recreation such as fishing. The breakwater would be approximately 280 feet long.

Project Rationale

This breakwater would protect watercraft from the prevailing winds on Lake Pepin as they launch. It would also provide additional public access to the lake for water-oriented recreation such as fishing.

Project Timeline

This project would be constructed between 2021 and 2024

Other Considerations

Coordination with the MN DNR and Army Corps of Engineers will be required

Impact on State Operating Subsidies**Who will own the facility?**

The breakwater would be owned and maintained by the City of Lake City, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The breakwater will be publicly accessible for water-oriented recreation

Public Purpose

To protect watercraft using the public boat ramp at Roschen Park in Lake City, and provide public water access for water-oriented recreation on Lake Pepin.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.058 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Roschen Park and Boat Ramp Breakwater

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,116 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$180 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,620 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$316 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,116 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Bank Restoration and Stabilization Along Lake Pepin**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$311 |
| Priority Ranking: | 3 |
| Project Summary: | \$311,000 in in state funds is requested to stabilize and restore the banks of Lake Pepin in Lake City, MN. |

Project Description

Replacement of approximately 580 feet of stone wall at Ohuta Park to prevent loss of public parkland adjacent Lake Pepin.

Project Rationale

Historic walls that were constructed to maintain public space in the City are degrading and leading to the possible loss of public space along the shores of Lake Pepin. Reinforcing and/or replacing these walls will insure that existing parks and public space will be maintained.

Project Timeline

Project construction would occur in 2023

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

City of Lake City, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City, MN

Who will use or occupy the facility?**Public Purpose**

The wall prevents erosion of public park space into Lake Pepin.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Rob Keehn
City Administrator

651-345-6813

rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Bank Restoration and Stabilization Along Lake Pepin

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$311 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$312 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$623 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$123 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$623 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Hok-Si-La Park Water and Sewer Extension

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$587 |
| Priority Ranking: | 4 |
| Project Summary: | \$587,000 in state funds is requested to design and construct water and sewer connection to Hok-Si-La Park, a regional park located in Lake City, MN. |

Project Description

This project will extend water and sewer to Hok-Si-La Park from the northernmost connection point of the City's distribution and collection.

Project Rationale

Connecting the park to City water and sewer services will allow for additional improvements to the park, while removing the need for on-site septic in close proximity to Lake Pepin.

Project Timeline

Project design would begin 01/2022 with construction occurring in 2024

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Lake City, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City, MN

Who will use or occupy the facility?

N/A

Public Purpose

Connecting the park to City water and sewer would allow the removal of on site septic systems and wells, and provide a safer way to handle the water and sewer needs of the park.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$587,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Hok-Si-La Park Water and Sewer Extension

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$587 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$588 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,175 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$175 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,175 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Mississippi Blufflands Trail Engineering Study**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$83 |
| Priority Ranking: | 5 |
| Project Summary: | \$83,000 in state funding to conduct an engineering study to develop the Mississippi Blufflands Trail route from Lake City, MN to Staehli Park in Florence Township, Goodhue County. |

Project Description

Funding will allow an engineering study to develop a preferred trail route for the Mississippi Blufflands Trail from the north end of Lake City, MN, to Staehli Park in Florence township, Goodhue County for the purposes of connecting Red Wing, MN and Lake City, MN with a multi-purpose trail.

Project Rationale

The Mississippi Blufflands trail has been approved, but the specific routing of the trail has not been determined between Red Wing, MN, and Lake City, MN. This project would determine the preferred route of the trail for a portion north of Lake City.

Project Timeline

The engineering study would be conducted in 2021.

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

The engineering study would be to determine best routing for the trail. If built it would be publicly maintained between the jurisdictions of Lake City and Goodhue County.

Who will operate the facility?

The City would maintain that portion of the trail built within its jurisdiction if constructed.

Who will use or occupy the facility?**Public Purpose**

The Mississippi Blufflands Trail would create a public multi-purpose trail that would connect Lake City, MN, to Red Wing, MN.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Mississippi Blufflands Trail Engineering Study

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$83 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$84 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$167 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$17 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$167 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Roschen Park Parking Lot Reconstruction**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$55 |
| Priority Ranking: | 6 |
| Project Summary: | \$55,000 in state funding to repave the parking lot at Roschen Park and boat ramp on Lake Pepin in Lake City, MN. |

Project Description

The project will repave the public parking lot that serves the public boat ramp and Roschen Park on Lake Pepin in Lake City. The parking lot provides boat trailer and vehicle parking for the park and boat ramp.

Project Rationale

Roschen Park and the public boat ramp adjacent provide public lake access and recreation opportunities. The parking lot that serves this facility is degrading and needs to be repaved to allow continued use of the facility.

Project Timeline**Other Considerations****Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

The park and boat ramp are owned by the State of Minnesota and maintained by the City of Lake City by agreement.

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This is a public facility

Public Purpose

Roschen Park and the boat ramp provide free access to Lake Pepin and water-oriented recreation opportunities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Roschen Park Parking Lot Reconstruction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$55 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$56 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$111 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$11 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$111 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Lake City - Sportsmans Club Parking Lot and Waterfront Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$106**Priority Ranking:** 7**Project Summary:** \$106,000 in State funding to develop the Lake City Sportsman's Club parking lot and provide waterfront recreational facilities along Lake Pepin in Lake City, MN**Project Description**

The project would pave the parking lot at the Lake City Sportsman's Club and create a public pavilion adjacent Lake Pepin to increase water-oriented recreation opportunities.

Project Rationale

Paving the parking lot would create a more durable surface and allow for stormwater best management practices to be implemented adjacent Lake Pepin, while the pavilion would provide a place for public recreation and better utilization of public land on the lake.

Project Timeline

The project will begin in 2022 and be completed in 2023

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

City of Lake City

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public usage shared with Lake City Sportsman's Club, a tenant of the City.

Public Purpose

Increase public access and utilization of City-owned land adjacent Lake Pepin.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Lake City - Sportsmans Club Parking Lot and Waterfront Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$106 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$106 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$212 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$180 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$32 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$212 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Lake City Government Pier Structural Engineering Study

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$22 |
| Priority Ranking: | 8 |
| Project Summary: | \$22,000 in state funding to conduct a structural engineering study of the Government Pier in Lake City, MN |

Project Description

The study would determine the structural integrity of the Government Pier in Lake City, and determine what improvements can safely be made to the structure to increase public access to Lake Pepin, and maintain the pier as an integral part of the Lake City Marina outer harbor.

Project Rationale

Determining the structural status of the pier will assist the City in planning for improvements that will allow for increased access by the public and help preserve the integrity of the structure as a part of the City's Marina harbor.

Project Timeline

The study would be conducted in 2021

Other Considerations

The pier was built and is owned by the Army Corps of Engineers. The City has been in discussion with the Corps regarding possible transfer of ownership.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies**Who will own the facility?**

Army Corps of Engineers

Who will operate the facility?

Army Corps of Engineers

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The pier is publicly accessible

Public Purpose

Improvements to the pier would increase public access to Lake Pepin.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Lake City Government Pier Structural Engineering Study

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$22 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$22 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$44 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$40 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$4 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$44 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Riverwalk Trail Extension

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$88 |
| Priority Ranking: | 9 |
| Project Summary: | \$88,000 in state funding to extend the Riverwalk Trail along Lake Pepin in Lake City, MN |

Project Description

This project would extend the 10 foot wide multi-purpose Riverwalk Trail from Park street at Highway 61 into the Lake City Marina and downtown area.

Project Rationale

A large portion of the Riverwalk Trail is being upgraded along Lake Pepin as part of the 2020 TH 61 reconstruction project. This project would continue the trail upgrade south along the lake in City Right-of-Way into the downtown area.

Project Timeline

The project would be constructed in 2022, with completion in 2024

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Lake City

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public multi-purpose trail

Public Purpose

Extension of an existing trail that will increase connectivity between the downtown/marina waterfront and Hok-Si-La Park.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Keehn
City Administrator
651-345-6813
rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Riverwalk Trail Extension

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$88 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$88 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$176 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$26 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$176 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Recreational and Athletic Facilities near Roschen Park**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$0**Priority Ranking:** 10**Project Summary:** \$96,000 in state money is requested in 2022 to construct recreation/athletic facilities on state-owned land near Roschen Park in Lake City, MN.**Project Description**

This project would construct a pickleball court on state-owned land near Roschen Park in Lake City.

Project Rationale

The intent of the project is to increase the recreational activities available to the public in close proximity to Lake Pepin.

Project Timeline**Other Considerations**

The City would need to enter into an agreement with the State to complete this project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies**Who will own the facility?**

City of Lake City

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lake City

Who will use or occupy the facility?

It will be a public facility

Public Purpose

Provide additional public recreation opportunities for community members and visitors

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Rob Keehn
City Administrator

651-345-6813

rkeehn@ci.lake-city.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Recreational and Athletic Facilities near Roschen Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$0 | \$96 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$97 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$0 | \$193 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$155 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$38 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$0 | \$193 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System JPB

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|--------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| LPRW Dawson-Boyd Water Source | 1 | GO | 14,421 | 17,431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 14,421 | 17,431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 14,421 | 17,431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

LPRW Dawson-Boyd Water Source

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$14,421

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System (LPRW) proposes to construct new groundwater wells, water treatment plant, transmission and distribution pipeline, and a pump station. LPRW proposes to initially provide potable water to the Cities of Dawson, Clarkfield, Wood Lake, Hanley Falls, and Belview and rural customers for agricultural production and/or household consumption. Other small cities are likely to be served in the future.

Project Description

Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System (LPRW) serves approximately 4,500 rural customers and 37 bulk municipal customers in 10 counties in southwest Minnesota. Originally constructed in the mid-1970's, the LPRW system has expanded over 40+ years as demand for reliable, affordable, potable water has grown. LPRW receives water service requests and adds several dozen rural customers throughout the system every year. Periodically, LPRW completes larger construction projects, adding up to several hundred users at a time, expanding or replacing existing facilities, or completing other hydraulic improvements to the system.

Over the last ten years, LPRW has received requests to provide water service to towns and rural customers in Redwood, Yellow Medicine, and Lac Qui Parle Counties. LPRW serves existing customers in portions of all three counties but requires a new water source and significant distribution system expansion and improvements to meet demands for new water service. The proposed project includes construction of groundwater wells, a water treatment plant (WTP), transmission and distribution pipeline, and a booster pump station. The project also includes metering facilities for new customers.

LPRW has located a reliable water source aquifer between the Cities of Dawson and Boyd. One production well has been installed so far. A 7-day pump test indicated that the well can sustainably produce 750 gpm. Three production wells minimum must be installed approximately 1 mile apart from each other and ideally no farther than 3 miles from the WTP. Raw water pipeline must be installed to deliver water from the wells to the WTP.

The water chemistry of the proposed water source was sampled and tested during aquifer pump testing. The natural groundwater contains high hardness and high concentrations of iron and manganese. LPRW proposes to construct a lime softening WTP to produce potable water meeting EPA primary and secondary MCL regulations. The WTP will be designed to treat and pump 1,500 gpm (2 MGD).

New water transmission and distribution pipelines are needed to deliver water from the WTP to end users. LPRW has some existing pipe in the area which can be used, but the increased demands from

new users require that additional pipeline be built. Additionally, some of the new customers lie outside of LPRW's existing service area, so pipeline will need to be built into areas currently unserved by LPRW. Pump stations are often necessary in distribution systems to overcome ground elevation changes and energy loss due to friction of water movement in a pipeline. Meter pits for individual rural users and bulk meter stations for municipal connections will also be installed as part of the project. The project will not include municipal infrastructure improvements downstream of the metered connection.

Project Rationale

LPRW currently serves the north part of their system from the Burr water source. The Burr WTP lies about 8 miles west of the City of Canby. LPRW has limited capacity to serve new water demands from the Burr water source because LPRW nearly reaches their water withdrawal permit amount from the Burr well field each year. LPRW purchases water from the neighboring Brookings-Deuel Rural Water System to not exceed the withdrawal permit. Furthermore, the existing transmission pipeline conveying water from the Burr WTP to existing LPRW water users in Lincoln, Lyon, Redwood, Yellow Medicine, and Lac Qui Parle Counties is very nearly at capacity and would require significant improvements even if the water was available at the Burr water source to deliver to the area of new growth. A new water source and new water pipeline are needed to serve demand.

Lack of good-quality water limits agricultural development. LPRW receives water service requests from farmers who wish to build new livestock confinement units in Lincoln, Lyon, Redwood, Yellow Medicine, and Lac Qui Parle Counties. Existing LPRW customers occasionally request permission for a larger water allocation to expand livestock facilities already served by rural water. LPRW denies both types of requests by necessity because of limited water source capacity at the Burr water source and limited transmission capacity from the Burr WTP. Farmers are forced to drill their own wells which is expensive or suspend plans for development. More livestock confinement units would be built or expanded if high quality water was readily available from LPRW.

Groundwater in Redwood, Yellow Medicine, and Lac Qui Parle Counties generally has high hardness and high concentrations of sulfate, iron, and manganese similar to the water found by LPRW during new water source exploration. Hardness and the minerals listed are not toxic, but they can cause water to taste bad, can cause water discoloration, and can stain or clog water use fixtures. Water hardness can be removed by individual water users using a typical home ion exchange softening system. Home softening systems produce a salty wastewater stream which is discharged to the sanitary sewer in a municipal setting and the septic system in a rural setting. Rural septic systems are unregulated, but the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has increased regulation of municipal salty wastewater discharge. Salty discharge from nearly every home in a town results in a significant amount of salty water entering the municipal wastewater treatment facility. The City of Dawson, for example, has high hardness in their water supply, so many homes and businesses have softening systems which discharge salty water to the city wastewater treatment plant. Initial capital costs and ongoing operation and maintenance costs are high for bulk municipal water hardness treatment or bulk municipal salty wastewater treatment. Small cities like Dawson have trouble financing new construction or upgrades to water or wastewater treatment plants. LPRW proposes to build a lime softening WTP and sell water to multiple cities including Dawson to reduce water hardness and salty wastewater discharge problems. The LPRW lime softening WTP will also remove iron and manganese.

Some city water sources are contaminated with minerals that are toxic for human consumption. The City of Hanley Falls' water source, for example, contains arsenic exceeding the EPA primary MCL. The City has an arsenic removal water treatment plant, but the city water bills are nearly three times

the statewide average because of expensive capital costs to build the water treatment plant and expensive operations and maintenance. The water source to be used by LPRW has small amounts of arsenic far below the EPA MCL.

Water treatment plants are expensive to build, operate, and maintain especially for small cities with a limited population to support a large building project. A new LPRW water source and WTP can provide reliable, affordable, safe water service to multiple cities and rural residents and boost agricultural development.

Project Timeline

The following project timeline assumes that funding for the project will be available in 2020.

Design: Aug 2020 – Nov 2021

Construction: Mar 2022 – May 2024

Other Considerations

LPRW has long sought a new water source in the north part of their system to offset demands on the Burr water source. A new water source will allow them to provide more water to existing customers who wish to expand livestock operations and serve new customers in Lincoln, Lyon, Redwood, Yellow Medicine, and Lac Qui Parle Counties. In 2008-2011, LPRW performed extensive water source exploration to secure a new water source near Wood Lake. A favorable aquifer was discovered, but the Minnesota DNR denied permission for LPRW to develop a water source because of potential damage to natural resources.

LPRW began exploration for a new water source near the City of Dawson in 2017. A favorable location for a well field has been found between the Cities of Dawson and Boyd. LPRW has worked closely with the DNR during exploration; the DNR has preliminarily indicated that there are no sensitive natural resources which may be damaged as a result of water source development. Based on water quantity and water quality information collected during a 7-day pump test of a well installed in the aquifer, LPRW proposes to install three total production wells and a lime-softening water treatment plant generally between the Cities of Dawson and Boyd.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

If fully funded, there should be no anticipated state funding requests associated with this project.

Who will own the facility?

Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System

Who will operate the facility?

Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System

Public Purpose

Public water supply/drinking water system

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not Applicable

Project Contact Person

JASON OVERBY
General Manager
507-368-4248
LPRW@ITCTEL.COM

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

Lincoln-Pipestone Rural Water System JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

LPRW Dawson-Boyd Water Source

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$14,421 | \$17,431 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$14,421 | \$17,431 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$998 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$376 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,364 | \$586 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,183 | \$13,823 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$3,022 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$14,421 | \$17,431 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Community Recreation Improvements | 1 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |

Community Recreation Improvements

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$5,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$5 million in state bond funding to design and construct Community Recreation Improvements in the City of Litchfield. |

Project Description

The City of Litchfield is looking to design and construct recreation improvements for the entire community. The proposed improvements include a combination of upgrading existing recreation facilities, as well as adding new recreation facilities to the community. In order to maintain the long-term viability of the City's civic arena, the rink floor and refrigeration piping beneath the floor need to be reconstructed. The City spent \$1.5M in 2018 to replace the refrigeration system and is now looking to complete the floor improvements. In addition, there are other miscellaneous improvements needed at the civic arena, as well as improvements to the City's park system to enhance the recreational opportunities for the community.

In addition to upgrading the existing facilities, the City is also looking to add a recreational facility to the community. This facility would provide residents of the City and surrounding area increased recreational opportunities that are currently unavailable. While the exact details of the facility are currently being explored, the facility may include some or all of the following amenities; gym space, meeting rooms, community room, walking track, zero entry pool, lazy river, etc. This facility would be available for use by all age groups in the community. In addition, the City is currently working with the Litchfield School District to possibly partner on this project to even further increase the recreational opportunities at the facility.

Project Rationale

The City of Litchfield is looking to design and construct recreational improvement for the community. Litchfield and the surrounding area is lacking recreational opportunities for their residents, including their senior citizens. This project would help address this deficiency. Given the cost of the improvements associated with a recreational facility, it is not economically feasible for the City to complete these improvements without the assistance of the State of Minnesota. This facility would serve not only the community of Litchfield, but all of Meeker County and beyond.

Project Timeline

| | Month/Year |
|--|------------|
| a. Funding Agency Applications | 6/2019 |
| b. Preparation of Plans and Specifications | 12/2020 |
| c. Funding Agency Review | 5/2021 |
| d. Council Authorizes Advertising | 5/2021 |
| e. Council Considers Awarding Project | 6/2021 |
| f. Begin Construction | 8/2021 |
| g. Substantial Completion | 12/2022 |

h. Final Completion
i. Project Closeout

6/2023
10/2023

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional State operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Litchfield

Who will operate the facility?

City of Litchfield

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Litchfield

Public Purpose

The City of Litchfield's construction of Community Recreation Improvements will provide the residents of Litchfield and the surrounding area with many improved recreational opportunities. The proposed recreational improvements will include a combination of improvements to existing facilities, as well as the construction of a new facility that will be available to all ages, including senior citizens. Without assistance from the State, these recreational opportunities are not economically feasible for the City of Litchfield.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This project has not received previous appropriations.

Project Contact Person

David Cziok
City Administrator
320-693-7201
dave.cziok@ci.litchfield.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Community Recreation Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| TH 27 Memorial Bridge - Rail Grade Separation | 1 | THB | 6,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 6,000 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TH 27 Memorial Bridge - Rail Grade Separation

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$6,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Memorial Bridge serves as the TH 27 crossing of the Mississippi River in downtown Little Falls. TH 27 has an at-grade rail crossing on the west side of the river for a single track operated by BNSF. MNDOT plans to replace the existing bridge in the next 10 years; however, their plans only replace the bridge & not address the at-grade crossing. The project is needed to align the bridge replacement with a rail grade separation to improve the safety of crossing the bridge and the railroad tracks.

Project Description

The City of Little Falls in 2017 completed a feasibility study for design alternatives of a rail grade separation over the BNSF line with the replacement of the TH 27 Memorial Bridge over the Mississippi River. The study showed that there are viable options to construct a bridge with a grade separation. The reason the City engaged in the study was that MNDOT has plans to reconstruct the bridge in the next 10 years; however, their plans do not include a grade separation. City officials met with MNDOT, and they indicated that any request for an alternative to an as-is replacement bridge, the City would be responsible to come up with the funds in excess of the approximately \$15 Million dollars they have planned for reconstruction.

The important facts about this bridge and our community are that 46 trains per day (according to the WBAPS report from 2018), and 13,600 vehicles travel across that the crossing just west of the bridge. This combination of train, traffic and location create a recipe for serious threats to public safety. We have thousands of residents on the west side of the river that while a train is traveling through Little Falls, are cut off and delayed crucial minutes from access to an ambulance, hospital, police response and the full arsenal of fire suppression equipment based on the east side of the bridge. Trains can obstruct access anywhere from 5 minutes to 20 minutes, and the quickest alternate route takes at least 10 minutes to detour around to the Highway 10 bridge; however, for the longer delays, the detour would likely be even longer, because as traffic waits to cross the Highway 27 Memorial Bridge it backs up 6 blocks in either direction waiting to cross the bridge. When every second counts in a life and death response, 10 minutes is critical.

Furthermore, the rail crossing has multiple crude rail lines that cross daily, the potential for a catastrophic event with an at-grade crossing is definitely a possibility, and due to the crossings proximity to the Mississippi River, the event would not only gravely impact the people of Little Falls, but anyone downstream.

During the 2018 Legislative Session, funds were allocated in a bill approved by both the House and Senate for the planning, environmental, and design work for this project; however, that bill was vetoed by Governor Dayton.

On June 5th 2019, a fire destroyed a building within a block of the rail crossing. Fortunately no one was injured and there were no reported delays in responding due to the crossing, but it was a scary reminder to our public safety teams how critical response times can be.

Project Rationale

This project is necessary to improve the safety of crossing TH 27, BNSF Railroad and the Mississippi River. Since MNDOT does not have plans to make greater safety improvements at this crossing we need the capital budget request to move the project forward. Furthermore, modifying the rail route through Little Falls, is not believed to be feasible and BNSF is not likely to initiate that effort.

Project Timeline

Planning/Environmental/Design – 9/21
Project Bid – 4/23
Award Contract – 5/23
Begin Construction – 6/23
Project Completion – 9/25

Other Considerations

TH 27 Memorial Bridge also will serve as the route for the Camp Ripley Veteran's State Trail currently under construction. The bridge reconstruction will incorporate a segregate path for bicycles and pedestrians to keep them safe from motor vehicles.

The rail grade separation will also improve the traffic flow from the east and west sides of Little Falls. This improvement can have a positive impact of the economy and transportation within the City.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The city does not intend to seek state grants to support the operation or maintenance of the bridge.

Who will own the facility?

MNDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MNDOT

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Users of TH 27, motor vehicles, non-motor vehicles and pedestrians.

Public Purpose

Safety and transportation across a railroad crossing and the Mississippi River.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jon Radermacher
City Administrator
320-616-5500
jonr@cityoflittlefalls.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$110 million in trunk highway bonds for grants to projects on the Department of Transportation's 2014 Crude by Rail Grade Crossing Study.

(\$ in thousands)

TH 27 Memorial Bridge - Rail Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$15,000 | \$5,000 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$25,000 | \$5,000 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$2,000 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$21,000 | \$5,000 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$25,000 | \$5,000 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Madison Recreation and Activity Center | 1 | GO | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,500 | 0 | 0 | 4,500 | 0 | 0 |

Madison Recreation and Activity Center

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$4,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City wants to construct a facility to enhance community interactions for our residents and surrounding communities. This facility will create a space for a variety of opportunities that are currently unavailable.

Project Description

A 34,000 sq. ft. and estimated \$9 million facility with direct access to the MMN Elementary site. This space will be utilized and provide a benefit to the child care center. The recreation and activities center will include the following:

1. Two full size basketball courts
2. Three lane running track
3. Weight/aerobics room
4. Fitness studios for exercise and yoga classes
5. Two racquetball courts
6. Locker rooms
7. Event space
8. Lobby, registration desk and office
9. Support spaces

The facility will serve all residents of the City, school district, and surrounding communities that lack multi-use space. The space will accommodate diverse age groups, and populations.

The ownership of the completed Recreation and Activity Center will belong to the City of Madison.

In addition to the \$4.5 million being requested from the state, additional funding sources include the following:

- Local fundraising goal of \$1 million from residents
- Partnership with local companies
- City and school joint powers "lease" agreement
- USDA RD Community Facility Program
- G.O. Bonds
- EDA Lease Revenue Bonds
- Other grant sources

Project Rationale

The need for the Recreation and Activity Center is based on a community meeting held in January 2017 and focus group discussion in April 2019. It is well known that community centers offer significant benefits to the people they serve; they provide meaningful gathering spaces, social functions and programs to keep people physically active. Currently, the Madison, MN community is

underserved, with no facilities of this type existing inside a 30 mile radius. Cities that lie within that 30 mile radius are Marietta–11 miles, Milan–20 miles, Appleton–20 miles and Nassau–14 miles. These communities also have needs that are not currently being met and would be users of the facility while creating a regional footprint. Presently, youth tournaments are frequently limited due to space concerns, which include JO volleyball, traveling basketball and many other youth activities that are non-school sponsored. However, these events are a tourism driver for many towns and businesses. Additionally, weddings and celebrations are limited in the region as well due to a lack of available large-capacity space. The region is asking for a place for these activities. In several of the cities previously mentioned, there are diverse ethnic communities that desire more community interaction to bring their unique festivals and religious ceremonies to the Recreation and Activity Center. In rural remote areas, it is essential to have common community spaces that can serve all and create economic development in the region. Regional retention and tourism are components that help to increase this viability through more visitors and a stable revenue stream for operations. Recreation is a key component of retention and revitalization of rural communities. Spaces utilized by the region create new ways of community interaction with diverse age groups, populations and provide year-round healthy living activities. Youth activities that help at-risk youth are needed. Space for youth activities are limited, and this center would help with youth activities and allow more mentoring within our community with multigenerational learning opportunities to include senior activities as well. The recently created child care center that is in the MMN elementary will utilize this extra space and enhance the programming of the center.

Project Timeline

- Fall 2019 Pre design work
- Spring 2020 prepare financing options
- Land acquisition agreement
- Summer 2020 knowledge of state bonding outcome
- Secure financing and fundraising drive
- Fall 2020 site preparation
- Spring 2021 construction
- Spring 2022 project completion

Other Considerations

To date, the following activities have been completed by the committee:

Community strategic meeting January 2017
Community Center Feasibility Study, October 2017
Child Care study received, February 2018
Tour Rec/Daycare Facilities, January 2018
Daycare Provider Meeting, April 2018
Daycare only Focus and School Ownership, May 2018
Opening of Little Eagles Daycare, February 2019
Refocus on Community Center project, April 2019

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NA

Who will own the facility?

The City of Madison

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Madison through a joint powers agreement.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City, school district, child care center, public, visitors to the community

Public Purpose

Community interaction, wellness of all ages, child and youth activities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

NA

Project Contact Person

Val Halvorson
City Manager
320-598-7373
val.halvorson@ci.madison.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$4.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Madison Recreation and Activity Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$8,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$90 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$435 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Water and Sewer Infrastructure Project | 1 | GO | 3,626 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,626 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,626 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Water and Sewer Infrastructure Project

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$3,626 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$3,626,000 in matching state funds is requested for engineering and the repair, replacement, and construction of water, sanitary sewer mains, and related infrastructure within the City of Mahnomen and the White Earth Indian Reservation. |

Project Description

The scope of the project is to make significant repairs to the city’s existing drinking water and clean water system.

The total cost of the project is \$10,239,000, and will address the construction, construction engineering, contingency and inflationary costs of the project. Therefore, the city is providing a match of 65% toward the total cost of construction.

The major components of the sanitary sewer replacement and repair project include:

- Replacing approximately 1,600 linear feet (LF) of deficient 8 inch, 10 inch, and/or 12 inch Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) sanitary sewer; and
- Replace approximately 4,000 LF of deficient 12 inch Vitrified Clay Pipe (VCP) sanitary sewer with new 12 inch PVC sanitary sewer; and
- Line approximately 4,600 LF of deficient 8 inch VCP sanitary sewer with cured-in-place pipe (CIPP) and
- Line (CIPP) approximately 1,800 LF of deficient 12 inch VCP sanitary sewer

Project Rationale

The City of Mahnomen (population 1,214) is located entirely within the boundary of the White Earth Indian Reservation and serves as the largest community on the reservation. The City of Mahnomen also serves as the county seat for Mahnomen County, and is considered to be the employment hub of the county and reservation. The city serves a trade area of approximately 6,500 residents. With a median HH income of \$36,513 or 56% of the state median HH income, and an underemployment and unemployment rate of 40%, the city of Mahnomen provides water and sewer to a disproportionately high number of low- to moderate-income families.

Financial implication to the White Earth Nation:

The crime rate on the reservation is already one of the highest, per capita in the state. In addition, with being the county with the poorest health outcome and health factors, the reservation relies heavily on the net-profits from its casino to fund the many public safety, health, and social service programs necessary to improve the conditions of the people that live within the reservation. Being, the casino contributes 30% of the water and sewer revenue to the city any water and sewer rate increase, as a result of not receiving state assistance for the water and sewer project, will cut into their ability to

provide needed services to those that benefit from their services.

Financial implication to residents and businesses:

In addition, the City provides water and sewer service to over 78 very low income tribal enrolled members. This project will adversely impact many of our residents, given the anticipated increase in the utility rates could rise by nearly 300% if the city is unable to secure additional outside grant assistance.

The city's current average delinquency rate for nonpayment is at 8-10 percent, which according to the Minnesota Rural Water Association is 400% higher than the average city. The high delinquency rate is due to the many low-income residents residing within the community, which will only worsen if the rates climb any higher.

In addition, the city has nearly 100 commercial users, of which a number of businesses are already on the brink of closing due to the high cost of operating a business in Minnesota and the inability to compete with the changing e-service and e-commerce economy. These businesses have expressed concern that further rising utility rates will force them to either close or cut back on hiring.

The project is also needed due to the increased cost borne by both the city and private residents and businesses whenever there is a water main break and/or sewer main backup. In fact, due to the community's aging water and sewer infrastructure, on average the city encounters 3-4 water main breaks and 2-4 sewer main backups a year.

Additional health risks and concerns:

Some of the city's cast iron water mains were built 60-100 years ago, and are insulated with asbestos. The city is concerned that with the frequency in water main breaks that are occurring throughout the city, there could be the potential for a health risk should any of the asbestos that was used to insulate the mains, becomes exposed as a result of a leak. Since the majority of the water mains are made of cast iron, these pipes are subject to corrosion and tuberculation, which can become a breeding ground for certain bacteria. These antiquated cast iron pipes will be replaced with PVC which is not affected by tuberculation, because their smooth, non-corrosive surfaces prevent the buildup of bacteria.

Additional rationale to repair and replace the sanitary sewer distribution system:

The televising of the city's sanitary sewer shows a regular frequency of pipe defects which include broken, missing, undersized, egg shaped, partially blocked, and otherwise deteriorated pipe. The number of sewer backups is becoming a frequent occurrence, especially in the southeast area of the city, where the sewer main is undersized and the pipe grade is very flat.

In addition, virtually all Vitrified Clay Pipe (VCP) and some sections of Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) pipe are experiencing inflow and infiltration (I&I) problems. The amount of I&I has caused problems in past high rain events, resulting in multiple sewer backups into residential and commercial properties.

Additional rationale to the water distribution system:

While many of the water mains are cast iron, the majority of the mains have reached the end of their useful service life. Just within the past five years the city has seen an increase in pipe failure due to electrolysis and pipe fatigue. For example, over the 2018-2019 winter there were over 4 water main breaks, of which one of them resulted in several highway commercial businesses to be without water for over a 5-day period.

Additionally, there are many locations in the city which are undersized or have dead end lines, which

result in poor water quality. The undersizing and dead ends also pose a fire and safety hazard, as some of the existing 4 inch mains are unable to handle the draw of water from the use of multiple fire hydrants in the event of a major fire.

Project Timeline

Predesign

2014 – December 31, 2018

Engineering Design

January 1, 2019 – May 31, 2019

Construction of Phases I-III

August 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022

Other Considerations

The city of Mahnomen is unique in that the city is located entirely within the boundary of a federally recognized Indian reservation. As such, some of the land in the city is held in trust by the federal government for the White Earth Nation and there are other lands owned by the tribe. It is the entities that are located on the federal trust property, which is impacting the city's ability to receive any PFA grants under the current PFA formula. In other words, if the federal trust lands were exempted the city would be able to demonstrate a hardship and be eligible for a state grant up to 60%.

The City of Mahnomen owns its water and sewer infrastructure, which include the water and sewer distribution system, a water storage tower, water tower plant, 2 wells, and 5 lift stations. The city also provides water and sewer service to a 78 unit low income tribal housing complex and the Shooting Star Casino, Hotel, and Events Center. Both the housing complex and casino are located on land that is held in trust from the federal government for the White Earth Band of Chippewa Indians.

While, the project will greatly benefit both the City and White Earth Nation, all of the repair and improvements funded with state bonding will be made on land 100% owned by the city.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None, as the revenue derived from the water and sewer rates will be able to pay for the on-going maintenance and future repairs to the system.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Mahnomen will own the facility

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Mahnomen will operate the facility

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The City of Mahnomen owns its water and sewer infrastructure, which includes the water and sewer distribution system, a water storage tower, water treatment plant, 2 wells, and 5 lift stations. The City also provides water and sewer to a 78 unit low income tribal housing complex and to the Shooting Star Casino, Hotel and Events center. This tribal housing complex is on land that is held in trust from the Federal Government for the White Earth Band of Chippewa Indians. For the housing development and casino property, the tribe owns the water and sewer infrastructure, but their infrastructure ties directly into the city's water and sewer mains. As a result, their sewage gets treated in our waste water ponds and their water is obtained from our wells and is treated through our water treatment plant.

Public Purpose

The city believes providing clean and safe drinking water and the proper discharge of sewage is an essential public purpose. In addition, being the city provides water to both the city and tribe, the city is concerned that without the state's assistance, the burden of having to pay the debt service on this project will create a burden onto our community's already low-income residents and businesses. Given the high concentration of low- to moderate-income families and businesses, the City is concerned about equity gap that exists between our residents and businesses. The inability to close this equity gap is a concern for the City, as it will make it difficult to attract and retain families and businesses to the area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The city has not been successful in securing previous state appropriations for this project. The city submitted a bonding request in 2018, as a result the city has already initiated the project. Since, the city cannot use bonding funds for construction activity that has already commenced the city will only expend dollars on the portion of the project's construction and engineering costs that have not yet been incurred.

As a result, the sunk costs for in progress projects will not be bondable, but will be counted as part of the required match.

Project Contact Person

Mitchell Berg
City Administrator
218-850-4885
cityadmin@arvig.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Water and Sewer Infrastructure Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,626 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$828 | \$5,785 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$828 | \$9,411 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$392 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$350 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$86 | \$9,177 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$234 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$828 | \$9,411 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Valley Opportunities | 1 | GO | 12,385 | 0 | 0 | 12,385 | 0 | 0 |
| Water Quality Mitigation | 2 | GO | 4,150 | 0 | 0 | 4,150 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 16,535 | 0 | 0 | 16,535 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 16,535 | 0 | 0 | 16,535 | 0 | 0 |

Valley Opportunities

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$12,385

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$12,385,600 is requested to predesign, design and construct improvements along the Minnesota River, Minnesota River Trail, Riverfront Park and Indian Creek in Mankato. The improvements would include riverbank stabilization along the Minnesota River, in-channel improvements along Indian Creek, connections and improvements to the Minnesota River Trail, and the construction and installation of improvements at Riverfront Park, such as a canopy and supporting structures.

Project Description

Mankato’s initial bonding requests have been restructured and reprioritized based on the increasing degradation of the Minnesota Riverbank. The wetland restoration project is still a priority and looked at as an impactful long term solution, but the extended flooding of the Minnesota River and heavy rainfall in July of 2019 caused the riverbank erosion issues to be even more pronounced, rising to an urgent need for repair.

This project consists of four main components. The first component includes riverbank stabilization measures along the Minnesota River to reduce erosion and protect the city's critical infrastructure. The need for stabilization along the Minnesota River at Land of Memories has risen to emergency status, given the increased rate of bank degradation and the anticipated impacts to the City’s shallow aquifer drinking water well. Riverbank stabilization along the Minnesota River to protect Riverfront Park and the City’s Water Resource Recovery Facility is another important aspect of this component. The second component of the project includes the installation of in-channel stream stabilization measures to reduce erosion along Indian Creek and associated tributaries. The third component includes improvements to Riverfront Park, such as a new canopy over the stage at the amphitheater and supporting structures. The final component of the project is the predesign of improving the Minnesota River Trail to State Trail standards, including a bridge between Land of Memories and Sibley Park, connections to Minneopa Trail and reclaiming a portion of a former limestone quarry to further expand the trail and create connections to the Germania Park neighborhood. Total project costs are \$16,157,000, with 23% of the cost being paid for with city funds. The City is seeking an 80% state contribution for the riverbank and ravine stabilization related components and a 50% state contribution for the recreation related components.

Project Rationale

Valley Opportunities is a city developed initiative aligned with our ongoing strategic plan that emphasizes affordability, stewardship and community building. Valley Opportunities is an effort to coalesce around the river, economic equity and community assets. While much of the residential component of this area is geographically close to the Minnesota River, Mankato's thriving City Center and recreational assets such as parks and trails, some of the adjacent neighborhoods have

barriers that prevent access. Stewardship of the Minnesota River as an asset to protect is a key component of the plan. The project for which bond funds are being sought represents some initial steps of this major effort. This project is necessary for a number of reasons, the first being the persistent erosion issues along the banks of the Minnesota River in Mankato. Mitigating river bank erosion along the Minnesota River will improve water quality by reducing sediment and associated nutrient loads, and will also protect city assets, such as the city's shallow aquifer drinking water wells. Riverfront Park is a regional draw and improvements will enhance the visitor's experience, as well as dramatically improve their access to the Minnesota River. Completing the predesign of Minnesota River Trail improvements is an important first step in establishing connections to Minneopa Trail and to ensuring adequate access and increased safety for anyone desiring to utilize the trail.

Project Timeline

Spring 2020 - Award of funds

July 2020 to October 2020 - Final design and bid process

November/December 2020 - Minnesota River bank stabilization and boat launch construction

September 2021 - Minnesota River Trail predesign begins

October 2021 - Canopy installation

December 2021 - Minnesota River Trail predesign completed

September 2022 to November 2022 - In-channel improvements

Other Considerations

The City of Mankato is undertaking numerous Valley Opportunities initiatives utilizing local resources and has completed a number of proactive steps to address water quality issues.

Please note, the erosion mitigation portions of this bonding request were considered during the 2019 legislative session under House File 1593 and Senate File 1902.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No state operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Mankato

Who will operate the facility?

City of Mankato

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Mankato. Residents and visitors will use the trail, park and river for recreational purposes.

Public Purpose

Riverbank and ravine stabilization will reduce erosion along the Minnesota River and protect our drinking water. Improved quality of public waters and protection of public water conveyances. Safety will be improved along the Minnesota River trail and recreational opportunities will be increased through trail improvements and connections, as well as improved river access.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not applicable.

Project Contact Person

Patrick Hentges
City Manager
507-387-8695
phentges@mankatomn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$12.385 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Valley Opportunities

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$12,385 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$3,772 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,157 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$1,463 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,014 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$12,730 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,157 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Water Quality Mitigation**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$4,150**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** \$4,150,000 is requested to acquire land and to design and construct improvements to reduce erosion and improve water quality in the Minnesota River-Mankato watershed, specifically by restoring wetlands.**Project Description**

Mankato's initial bonding requests have been restructured and reprioritized based on the increasing degradation of the Minnesota Riverbank. The wetland restoration project is still a priority and looked at as an impactful long term solution, but the extended flooding of the Minnesota River and heavy rainfall in July of 2019 caused the riverbank erosion issues to be even more pronounced, rising to an urgent need for repair.

The proposed water quality improvement project will address intensifying water quality degradation issues associated with the Southeast watershed. The major component of the project includes the restoration of wetlands, which would reduce the discharge rate into the natural receiving streams, re-establish natural filtration of sediment and nutrients, including nitrogen and phosphorus, and reduce erosion. Total project costs are \$8,300,000. Matching funds will be provided by the city through local option sales tax.

Project Rationale

This project is necessary to address growing water quality issues associated with the Southeast watershed. The project will reduce mobilization and transport of sediments to the Minnesota River and reduce nutrients, such as nitrogen and phosphorus. Wetland restoration in the rural minor watersheds will reduce uncontrolled peak flows into the city storm water management facilities that currently reduces the system's capacity by up to 50 percent during major precipitation events and has caused severe erosion within ravine systems and flooding of residential areas. Wetland impacts in the rural areas of the minor watersheds have removed approximately 210-acre feet of natural storm water retention and the improvements will aim to restore the retention capacity. In addition, the wetland restoration will reduce total suspended solids by over 63 percent and reduce phosphorus discharge by over 70 percent.

Project Timeline

Spring 2020 - Award of funds

July 2020 to September 2020 - Final design work and property acquisition

October 2021 - Begin wetland restoration

July 2022 - Complete wetland restoration work

June 2023 - Final acceptance of wetland restoration

Other Considerations

The City of Mankato has undertaken a number of proactive steps to address water quality issues within the city, including a recent comprehensive watershed study to identify the hydrologic and hydraulic characteristics of the watershed and the major creeks, ravines and waterways.

Please note, this bonding request was considered during the 2019 legislative session under House File 1593 and Senate File 1902.

The initial submittal of this project included other aspects of the water quality project, such as in-channel improvements and riverbank stabilization, however, given the rapid rate of degradation to the riverbank, the improvements have reached emergency status and were removed from this request and placed in the Valley Opportunities request.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The city does not intend to seek state subsidies to operate or maintain the project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Mankato

Who will operate the facility?

City of Mankato

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Mankato

Public Purpose

Improved quality of public waters and protection of public water conveyances.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Pat Hentges
City Manager
507-387-8695
phentges@mankatomn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$4.15 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Quality Mitigation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$4,150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,300 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,430 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$443 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$443 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$416 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,568 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,300 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 610 Extension of TH 610 to CSAH 30 | 1 | THB | 18,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| North Metro Range Regional Public Safety Training Facility Expansion | 2 | GO | 6,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 24,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 18,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 610 Extension of TH 610 to CSAH 30**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$18,000**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: \$18 million in state funds is requested to acquire right of way, design and construct the CSAH 610 extension of TH 610 to connect to CSAH 30. TH 610 has been constructed in phases over the past 30 years and completion of this multi-modal, transportation corridor serves a regionally significant connection to transit opportunities and job centers.

Project Description

The CSAH 610 extension of TH 610 to CSAH 30 is an integral element of the overall TH 610/Highway 10 project. The TH 610 corridor (historically referred to as North Crosstown) connects communities and highways in the north metro area for the purpose of serving job centers, community needs and movement of freight.

Currently, TH 610 has partial connections to I-94. The planning and construction TH 610 and the CSAH 610 extension has been in the works since 1973. The 1993 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and subsequently, the MnDOT 2013 EIS Update and Scoping & Cost Analysis evaluated the project elements, freeway connections and connections to local roads. There remains an element of TH 610 to complete the connections to I-94 that MnDOT would fund with trunk highway funds.

The CSAH 610 extension project consists of bridges, roadway and storm drainage systems and pedestrian/bicycle facilities connecting a large urbanizing area of Hennepin County, and areas beyond, to job centers, transit opportunities, health care as well as accommodating the movement of freight. The project is consistent with local and regional comprehensive planning, the Met Council Transportation Policy Plan and would finally finish the metro area highway systems plan that has been in the works for decades.

The various planning efforts by the City of Maple Grove, Hennepin County, MnDOT and the Met Council has identified the purpose and need of the TH 610 corridor and the CSAH 610 connection to CSAH 30 as integral components of the transportation system serving not only the north metro area but regions beyond. The CSAH 30 corridor serves a large area between Highway 55 and I-94 not currently served by a state highway and traffic comes from cities and counties beyond the metro area.

The estimated cost to complete the TH 610 connections to I-94 is \$18 million and would be funded by MnDOT trunk highway funds. The estimated cost of the CSAH 610 extension to CSAH 30 is \$30 million and it is anticipated to be funded as follows:

- \$7.0 million federal funds as administered by the Met Council Regional Solicitation funding process.
- \$18.0 million request of 2020 State Capital Budget System.
- \$5.0 million local funds.

The CSAH 610 extension project is important to the City, Hennepin County and counties to the west and the State. With the ever expanding transportation needs within Hennepin County providing for roads and bridges, bus transit and LRT, this request seeks funding assistance from the State. With the regional significance of the project, the request is truly a sound capital investment for the State.

Project Rationale

The overall TH 610 and CSAH 30 extension project is a critical component of the metro area highway system. The CSAH 30 corridor serves a large area between Highway 55 and I-94 not served by a state highway and traffic comes from cities and counties beyond the metro area destined to job centers, health care, social connections and movement of freight. The function of the roadway is such that it provides a reliever to I-94. For the transportation system to function properly, all elements of the system need to be in-place. When some components are missing, the other components do not function as intended. We have clearly experienced the unintended consequences of staged construction and uncompleted elements, which is the current status of the overall project.

The 1993 EIS identified the need to replace the antiquated CSAH 30 interchange with I-94 to support the design of the planned I-94/TH 610 connections. The City of Maple Grove reconstructed the interchange, creating Maple Grove Parkway, at a cost of \$32 million, funded entirely by the City and private partnerships. This interchange is essential to providing access to the Maple Grove Hospital, its supporting medical office facilities and an vibrant commercial destination.

The MnDOT 2013 EIS Update of the traffic analysis reveals that in the absence of the CSAH 610 extension to CSAH 30, traffic congestion on CSAH 30 and the Maple Grove interchange will provide an unacceptable level of service and potential safety concerns with traffic backing up on the I-94 off ramps into main lines of freeway traffic.

The I-94 corridor from Maple Grove to Rogers will undergo significant construction consisting of pavement replacement and additional lanes beginning in 2019 and extending at least through 2021. The pavement replacement project, although needed, will cause considerable traffic disruption along the corridor throughout that period of time. With the needed improvements to complete TH 610 and the CSAH 610 extension, it seems prudent and in the best interests of the public to make those improvements with the current project, thereby eliminating the need for traffic disruption in the future.

Project Timeline

With funding assistance from the 2020 Capital Budget, the following project timeline is presented:

- Completion of Environmental Assessment and Interstate Access Request June, 2020
- Completion of final design July, 2020
- Acquisition of right of way Dec.,2020
- Project bidding Jan., 2021
- Begin construction Mar.,2021
- Complete construction Nov.,2021

Other Considerations

It is in the public best interests to complete this project to avoid future traffic disruptions within the I-94 corridor. Time is of the essence to identify funding for the project so that the various tasks are completed within the project timeline. In absence of identified funding, certain critical tasks cannot be signed off on allowing the next step to proceed. With that in mind, if the timeline gets extended the

project will not coincide with the pavement replacement project. Having another project of this nature following up a number of years after the pavement replacement project appears to be poor planning by the public.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The project will not result in additional expenditures or operating subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

Hennepin County

Who will operate the facility?

Hennepin County Transportation Department

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General motoring public of the State.

Public Purpose

The City of Maple Grove has a significant investment within the transportation infrastructure of the area, as does MnDOT and Hennepin County. In absence of completing all of the elements of the transportation system, some of the elements in use today will fail to operate as intended. When that happens there is cascading effect on other parallel corridors. The end result is regional traffic ending up on local streets causing significant safety concerns as these streets are not designed to accommodate that traffic.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The State has made significant investments in planning, design and constructing TH 610 providing for its current elements and partial connection to I-94. There is very little left to complete. There has also been a significant investment by MnDOT, City of Maple Grove and the Right of Way Acquisition Loan Fund for purchase of right way for finishing the trunk highway elements and the CSAH extension. It is the position of MnDOT that the final phase will be completed in conjunction with the CSAH 610 extension to CSAH 30. The CSAH extension will not be completed until which time funding can be identified and committed.

Project Contact Person

Ken Ashfeld
Director of Public Works/ City Engineer
612-494-6351
kashfeld@maplegrovern.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 610 Extension of TH 610 to CSAH 30

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$18,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$8,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$33,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$33,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

North Metro Range Regional Public Safety Training Facility Expansion

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$6,500

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: The City of Maple Grove is requesting \$6.5 million in state funds to prepare a site, design, and construct the expansion of the Maple Grove North Metro Range regional public safety training facility located in Maple Grove.

Project Description

The City of Maple Grove is requesting the appropriation of bond fund grant proceeds to prepare a site, design, and construct an approximately 24,000 square foot expansion of the Maple Grove North Metro Range (NMR) regional public safety training facility located in Maple Grove, Hennepin County. The expansion will occur on property owned by the City of Maple Grove. The total capital funds requested will not exceed \$6,500,000 with a total project cost of \$13,000,000. The City of Maple Grove would fund the remaining \$6,500,000.

In 1992, the City of Maple Grove constructed the 20,000 square foot NMR, which became operational in 1993. The facility provided an indoor firing range, training classroom, and a firearms simulator to meet the training needs at the time. Following a fire in 2011, the NMR was upgraded to over 22,000 square feet. The City of Maple Grove as the owner, operator, and user of the facility funded the original cost of the NMR with city funds and funds provided by a single law enforcement agency customer. Today, the facility now serves nearly 20 customer organizations, which include local, county, state, and federal law enforcement agencies and post-secondary law-enforcement education institutions. The NMR is also available for limited public rental use of the facility to meet statutory requirements. Between the City’s needs and those of the current customer organizations, the NMR is near capacity.

Growth in population, and therefore, the quantity of officers and agencies seeking training venues have increased significantly since the original construction. Additional agencies have expressed interest in training at this location due to its proximity to the growing north western metropolitan region. The current facility cannot accommodate this increase in demand now or into the future. Further, the needs for additional class room space for modern training classes such as crisis intervention and de-escalation and more realistic scenario-based training have grown since the NMR was originally constructed. Increased training space will include virtual simulator and “simunition” (i.e., non-lethal firearms training) allowing officers to train more effectively in an authentic, representational environment. Officers will experience problem solving in a controlled-stress setting and develop decision making tactics and capabilities. Additionally, without another regional public safety training facility in the area, the NMR is without redundancy capabilities to service Maple Grove and its customer organizations’ needs if the facility experienced any type of long-term failure.

Project Rationale

The current 26-years old facility serves Maple Grove and 20 surrounding public safety agencies. An expansion of the NMR is needed to increase training capacity as the current level of use causes difficulty for agencies to schedule training time, to increase training time to stay ahead of state mandates or to serve the demand of additional agencies across the region. Additionally, there is a need to modernize the facility's training capabilities to serve new training curricula with relevant, modern technologies. Additional agencies and organizations have expressed interest in utilizing the facility, however, that cannot be accommodated without an increase in its current size.

Additional classroom space will provide much needed space for modern training classes h as crisis intervention and de-escalation. The addition of more advanced realistic scenario-based training will allow officers to train more effectively in an authentic, representational environment. Officers will experience problem-solving in a controlled stress setting and develop decision making tactics. The facility has a proven track record of being fiscally balanced, supporting all operating funds internally with the new expansion to be supported in the same fiscally responsible manner.

Project Timeline

July 2020 - Feb 2021: Design phases
Feb 2021 - May 2021: Bidding
May 2021: Construction start
November 2021: Mid-point of construction
June 2022: Building construction complete

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City of Maple Grove will not need or seek additional state subsidies to operate or maintain the asset for which funding is requested.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Maple Grove

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Maple Grove

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The City of Maple Grove and any other public safety governmental agency customer organizations.

Public Purpose

Public safety personnel are entrusted with the tremendous responsibility to keep their communities safe. Expansion of the North Metro Range (NMR) regional public safety training facility will provide for the modern training needs of public safety in a cost-efficient manner. The City of Maple Grove invested in the NMR, a model in collaborating with other units of government. The facility has provided an environment which produces high quality trained public safety personnel at various levels of government. Personnel using the facility return to their communities professionally prepared for the challenges they face. Today, there is greater interest in the use of the facility and increased training demands for public safety personnel. The expansion of the NMR will ensure public safety personnel

have access to the highest quality facility that provides training utilizing the latest methods, technology, and tactics for policing as expected by the public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Eric T. Werner
Chief of Police
763-494-6101
ewerner@maplegrovern.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

(\$ in thousands)

North Metro Range Regional Public Safety Training Facility Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$13,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$5 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,085 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,785 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$13,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| City of Marble Water Tower | 1 | GO | 905 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 905 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 905 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

City of Marble Water Tower

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$905 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | Replacement of water tower. |

Project Description

The water tower project would generally consist of constructing a new 75,000-gallon hydrocone-style tank on the existing site, removing the existing tank, and making the appropriate site modifications.

Project Rationale

The need for this project was determined based on a June 2018 inspection report conducted by KLM Engineering. Alternatives would include repairing the water tower for an estimated amount of \$490,000, which would only extend the life of the tower 20 years. A new tower, however, would be about \$725,000 and would have an approximate lifespan of 125 years.

Project Timeline

Tentative project schedule:

- Engineering plans would be completed by Feb 2020
- Bid project in March 2020 and award in April
- Construction from May to October 2020

Other Considerations

None currently

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Unknown

Who will own the facility?

City of Marble

Who will operate the facility?

City of Marble

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents of the City of Marble

Public Purpose

The need for this project was determined based on a June 2018 inspection report conducted by KLM Engineering.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Funding for new City Hall.

Project Contact Person

SARAH JAYNE LITCHKE

City Clerk

218-247-7576

marblecity@mchsi.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

City of Marble Water Tower

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$905 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$905 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$5 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$825 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$905 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | N/A |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Martin County Justice Center | 1 | GO | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Martin County Veterans Memorial | 2 | GO | 300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 20,300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 20,300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 0 |

Martin County Justice Center

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$20,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Martin County, MN is requesting \$20 million in state funds for to acquire land, predesign, design, construct, to include furnishings and equipment for a County Justice Center facility to be located in Fairmont, MN (county seat). This facility would include the County jail (64 bed capacity), Sheriff/Fairmont Police Department, Dispatch, Emergency Management), County Attorney offices, Victim Witness offices, to include courts/judges offices, Courtroom, Court Service/DOC offices.

Project Description

As The County is facing major safety and security challenges with both the historic Courthouse built in 1907 and the Security Building constructed in 1973 connected by a single public walkway. In addition the mechanical and electrical infrastructure at the Security Building is primarily original and contributes to approximately \$5.8 million dollars in deferred maintenance. The County completed a Jail Study in 2018 and developed the most cost effective solutions through a planning process facilitated with the help of Wold Architects and Engineers. The results of that study lead to a new Justice Facility to be constructed on a new site that will house the Jail, Law Enforcement related offices, including the Sherriff's office, Fairmont Police Department (through an agreement to share/construct space with them), Dispatch, Emergency Management, County Attorney offices, Victim Witness offices, all court related offices, to include Courts/Judges offices, 2- fully operational Courtrooms, Court Service/DOC Offices (including felony office). Currently the amount of space that these programs utilize is 46,700 SF. The new facility is planned to be 73,091 square feet to accommodate the current space and security deficiencies (including secure spaces), as well as expanding the jail capacity to reduce the increasing costs of transporting inmates to and from other Counties and create a facility that is not threatened with a decrease in classification from the DOC based on the inability to properly provide programs space, recreation space, and proper supervision and classification of varying types of inmates.

The facility will support the regional need for temporary Mental Health holding for individuals that should not be placed within the County Jail, but are found to be in need of more intensive Mental Health support services. These spaces will allow for evaluation and temporary space that is secure and safe for individuals that are awaiting placement at a Mental Health Facility.

The new Justice Center facility will provide an adequate amount of bed space to dramatically decrease the practice of housing out of county. The layout of the facility will also provide "three zone" security that will allow inmates to enter the courtroom directly from the jail without entering either public space, or court staff space. Additionally, the new facility will be designed to comply with current DOC standards and trends that will facilitate a Jail that can more easily monitor and move inmates without compromising safety, as well as provide space that meets current guidelines.

This shift to more centralized operations and compact building footprint will decrease operational

costs in several ways. Transportation costs a staff will not spend the time or miles on the road between various different counties, inmate transfer within the facility will be instantaneous without the strategic time delays as in current practice to eliminate potential security risks, and maintain a presence in the courtroom.

As additional benefit of the project is keeping deputies within the County with the decrease in transport requirements. This increases the local presence of Law Enforcement within the county.

With all justice related departments under one roof a culture of seamless and efficiency will quickly develop. As this transcends County Staff, the community as a whole will reap the benefits of increased safety, quicker service, and a building facility that reflects the values of the citizens that helped make this important investment. The project will also include ADA compliant courtrooms and the ability of to weapon screen the facility.

The County has reviewed and narrowed the selection of the site for the facility in Fairmont, MN (county seat).

Budget

The construction costs of the proposed Justice Center building facility itself is estimated at \$29,444, 000. approximately \$1.5 million in land acquisition cost (including site preparation), and furniture, fixtures and equipment are included and remaining project pre design, design fees, testing, contingencies, for an estimated cost for the entire project request at \$41,806, 000. (See Project Cost Form)

The key funding sources would come from the State Bonding funds and local funding from Martin County.

Project Rationale

As Martin County continues to serve Southwestern Minnesota, it has pushed for a strong balance between offering the public the best services an safest operations while trying to mindful of the ever-growing pressure on the tax base provided by the heavy agriculture economy in the region.

Current operations includes the inefficient practice of housing inmates outside Martin County. This impacts not only the Sheriff's Office for transport, but also any staff from Human Services, Probation and DOC, and the County Attorney's Office that need to interface with persons in custody. Additionally, when inmates are required to make court appearances, they are transferred from the existing Security Building through the interior public areas up to the existing courtroom in the courthouse. Needless to say, this poses a security and safety risk as well as compromises the goal of due process for the County's criminal justice system. When considering the interior configuration of the Jail, there are several aspects of the layout that do not fully support the safety of inmates or staff.

In looking towards a future of public safety and efficiency the County recognizes that the current Security Buiding housing the County Jail, Sheriff's Office, Fairmont Police Department along with court operations with the main Courtroom at the Historic Courthouse cannot continue to function under current conditions. Numerous studies and analysis of the cost and risks of continuing "business as usual" have proven current operations are not sustainable, nor does this approach set the County up to be good stewards of taxpayers dollars in the future.

Over the last ten to fifteen years the Martin County Law Enforcement Center has meet numerous challenges with our current facility. The main concerns being the safety and security of the Jail along with the availability of inmate beds in other facilities, the safety and security of the Courthouse and courtrooms, and the public areas of the two buildings.

Jail

The jail has faced numerous challenges keeping up with DOC regulations for the size and design of

the facility. Due to these challenges in 2006 and 2007 Martin County formed a Justice Committee to evaluate any options to address the concerns. At that time the study recommended a new facility, but it was determined to not be economically feasible. We operated for several years on a DOC variance, but once we modified two cells to meet the requirements we then lost two more beds due to square footage regulations. The current design of the jail also doesn't allow for proper segregation for different inmate classifications. We are not allowed to house female or juvenile inmates, so they all need to be transported to other facilities, which is an increased cost to taxpayers. Our old design also doesn't allow us to house inmates with high medical needs. We have to contract with other counties to house them in more expensive medical bed cells.

There have always been concerns about housing the mentally ill. Over time the Martin County jail has received a number of mentally ill inmates and is struggling to safely place them. Some become violent and we need an adequate jail set up to handle these inmates. We have no place nearby for them to get treatment; a newer cell design helps to address the safety needs with these inmates.

There is a current lack of nearby jail space in surrounding counties like Jackson, Watonwan, Cottonwood, Murray, Rock, Pipestone and Waseca. Most of the surrounding larger counties have federal or other types of contracts and do not have room for our inmates. Some of those counties are Nobles, Freeborn, Brown, and Blue Earth. A majority of our inmates go to Faribault County, but depending on the circumstances we have to house inmates in counties from 1.5 to 3 hours away like Scott, Goodhue, and Rice. This just increases tax payer costs to transport costs the farther away we have to go.

The project will have a Regional impact because by increasing our daily capacity we would be able to help the surrounding counties if they are dealing with spikes in their population.

Although the jail has been taken care of the facility is nearly 45 years old (built in 1973). The current jail design is not efficient to operate according to the Department of Corrections (DOC) standards and has a lot of wear and tear on the facility. Our current jail facility has a 32 bed facility, but we are only allowed to operate 25 beds.

The jail is becoming more and more antiquated, not only in the equipment, but the design of the jail itself. We are not able to remodel the jail to meet modern operating and building standards. Repair parts for the jail are not readily available and are harder and harder to find or have been discontinued due to the age of the equipment to operate the jail.

Jail projections support an increase from the existing 32 bed facility to an approximately 64 bed facility. There is a lack of adequate separation/classifications, varying interview rooms are lacking, detox locations are inconsistent, cost for boarding and transporting inmates continues to increase (approximately \$400,000 for 2016), and jail spaces no longer meet DOC requirements.

Our average daily inmate population ranges from 32-36, which has spikes as high as 50 inmates per day at times. We are looking to build a 64 bed capacity facility, which would mitigate these fluctuations in the daily jail population and the ongoing increases in overall jail population. Our main objectives include building a jail facility that is up to modern standards (ie programming, accessibility and safety of inmates to court and staff). Housing our own inmates in the county and not having to seek out and travel to other counties for jail space, which transportation and housing of prisoners in outside jails is costing the county upwards of \$300-400,000 per year. This expense would be better used for expenses toward our own facility.

Additionally, the facility will support the regional need for temporary Mental Health holding for individuals that should not be placed within the County Jail, but are found to be in need of more intensive Mental Health support services. These spaces will allow for evaluation and temporary space that is secure and safe for individuals that are awaiting placement at a Mental Health Facility.

Courthouse/courtrooms

In the last year we have conducted a security study for our facilities, and we have identified several security issues for the courts and court rooms. Most of the security issues we are not able to solve with our current facilities.

The courtrooms lack adequate ADA accessibility. They also lack basic security provisions for securing inmates, separating attorneys and court staff areas and the public. The courtrooms lack the modern court room procedural areas for screening the public before they enter/access the courtrooms. The courtroom areas lack proper meeting space for attorneys and their clients. There is limited dedicated space for jury members or jury candidates before they are chosen. They lack a secure method for bringing inmates to the courtrooms, and a secure place to hold them while waiting for court. All inmates are walked through unsecure public areas, including hallways, lobbies, past unsecured county offices, and through public stairways.

The flow of inmates into the current court system and courtrooms is one of the major areas of concern for the safety of staff and the public since there is no secure access to the courtrooms. In the process of walking inmates to the different courtrooms, they not only pass through unsecured public areas, but they also pass through lobby areas where victims or family members and other court personnel are located. There have been times where inmates who are going to or from court are extremely agitated, they cuss and swear and scare other county staff and the public. We have had to physically escort them along the way, and we have had to place them on the ground for different security concerns. All this has to be done in areas open to the public, where someone could be waiting to intervene to help an inmate escape or even worse.

Public access areas of the two buildings

The facilities lack any form of a secure entrance to screen the public before they interact with county staff and offices. It lacks separate lobby space for the public for the various offices. To maintain operational efficiency numerous offices are located in the same facility. This works great for staff who need to collaborate between departments, but it creates challenges as well because of our facilities design. The general public, who are coming in for different services are all forced to share the same space. Anything from victims coming in to meet with an advocate, or a suspect who has been placed on probation meeting with an agent, an inmate reporting to jail, or both suspects and victims that law enforcement are trying to interview for other investigations. Not to mention the security concern listed previously in the courtroom section of walking the inmates through all these public areas.

The county offices are currently located in the courthouse. The courthouse no longer has the floor space to meet all the county needs. The County Attorney office and the Veteran Services office are now located in other off site rented facilities due to lack of space at the courthouse, which increases costs to taxpayers due to rent. These facilities lack any security. The County Attorney office should be located in the same building as the other county offices and law enforcement to facilitate interaction between them. There is no room in the courthouse for further expansion of any of the county offices located there.

We want all the different offices in the justice system to be co-located to maintain efficiency, but we need a safer and more professional flow to the public access to better serve their needs.

We are in need of a new facility in order to meet our anticipated needs for the next 40-50 + years and beyond. To improve security, privacy, and impartiality for all staff, public, and incarcerated persons.

The age of the current facilities results in the need for expensive maintenance costs. The deferred maintenance expenses for the Security Building is estimated at \$5, 810,000. It is expected that the maintenance costs will only continue to escalate given the age of the facilities. These funds would better be spent on a new facility.

Overall, the jail facility offers a dramatic decrease in transport costs. Additionally, the facility will support the overall safety and efficiency of County staff and the general public. As the community at large considers the future, the new Justice Center will support the County's needs for the next 20 years and include flexibility to be viable for the public well beyond that.

We acknowledge the increase operational cost for a new facility, therefore State bonds funds are needed to help pay for construction of the proposed Justice building facility.

Project Timeline

The County has completed a Jail study in 2018 and has a final draft pre-design report (2019) for the facility that reconfirms program needs and develop a solution that aligns with the proposed budget. If state funding is approved in 2020, It is estimated that it will be 10-12 month design process and completed on or about March 2021 and would begin to allow the County to bid the new facility towards mid to the end of 2021. Construction is anticipated to take 12-18 months, with a move-in date toward the end of 2023.

Other Considerations

Local Tax Impact:

Without state bonding assistance, the county's levy to construct the Justice Center would increase over 11%.

- Agricultural land represents 57% of the county's tax base. Ag values have decreased in the past three years;
- Residential property represents 22% of the county's tax base
- Industrial/Commercial represents 12% of county's tax base
- Utilities, Railroads, Personal Property represents 9% of tax base

Martin County has a limited Industrial/Commercial tax base. The burden of constructing the Justice Center without bonding assistance would fall mainly on residential and agricultural taxpayers.

Statutory Program Citation: MN Statute Chpt. 641.21 and Chpt. 475

There is no required referendum required for this project.

We would ask for your support and consideration to include our request in the 2020 State Bonding bill. This is a much needed jail facility that would have a positive impact on the region. Thank you.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None. There will be no additional state operating dollars that will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

It will be owned and operated by County of Martin, MN

Who will operate the facility?

The Martin County Justice Center facility will be operated by Martin County, under the direction of the County Board of Commissioners of Martin, MN

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The public will be using the facility for county and court related business as it relates to the county justice system.

- The facility will house the county jail (64 bed capacity, mental health, juvenile hold) inmates and jail staff
- Law enforcement (Sheriff/Fairmont Police Department), Dispatch, Emergency Management offices and related personnel
- County Attorney offices and staff
- Victim Witness offices, clients and staff

- Courts/judges offices and staff, including 2-Courtrooms,
- Court Services/MN DOC offices (including Felony DOC Office) clients and staff.

Public Purpose

It is the responsibility of the county to provide and conduct such services and other statutory requirements related to the criminal justice system to the public. The construction of this building facility will address the future needs of the county and its delivery of services to the public for the next 40-50+ years, not only with the increased jail space, but to provide a modern building facility, which addresses, the security, privacy and impartiality of all staff, public, and incarcerated persons.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Martin County has not received previous state appropriations for this project. There were no previous appropriations to Martin County.

Project Contact Person

Scott Higgins
County Coordinator
507-238-3126
scott.higgins@co.martin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Martin County Justice Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$21,912 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$41,912 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$16 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,651 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$29,444 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$4,220 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$6,081 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$41,912 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Martin County Veterans Memorial

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$300 |
| Priority Ranking: | 2 |
| Project Summary: | \$300,000 in state funds is requested to help complete the back part of our Martin County Veteran Memorial located at 507 Winnebago Ave., Fairmont, MN |

Project Description

The memorial is located on a tract of land, approximately 32,000 sq ft, valued at \$39,446 which was donated by a local Vietnam veteran to the MCVM organization and transferred to Martin County. It is located at 507 Winnebago Ave., Fairmont, MN.

Project will consist of entrance sign, 70’ flag pole with 15’ x 25’ US flag display, black granite wall to accommodate the engraved names of all Martin County veterans, 4 bronze tribute statues and presentation area in front of wall, black granite sponsor and military branches display wall. Area behind the wall will be a secluded natural setting with 6 additional bronze statues of combat era soldiers with a series of benches, sidewalks and paths, with military helicopter at end of property. This area is designated for the quiet reflection of friends, family, and others as they remember their loved ones who have served in our armed forces.

Project Rationale

The Martin County Veteran Memorial project aims to commemorate the men and women of Martin County who have served in our armed forces. Martin County has an estimated population near 20,000 and over 5,000 resident veterans from the communities of Fairmont (County seat), Sherburn, Trimont, Welcome, Dunnell, Ormsby, Granada, East Chain, Truman, Northrop and Ceylon have participated in the armed services of the US from WWI, WWII, Korean War, Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan. 86 who died in action while in service to their county.

Project Timeline

MCVM committee was organized in January 2016 with project participants consisting of local veterans. We had the land donated for the memorial donated in 2017. The front portion of the memorial (including the 100 ton Memorial sign near the street, the 70 foot flag pole and the Granit memorial wall, began in 2017 is scheduled to be completed late Summer 2019.

The back part of the memorial including the secluded natural setting behind the wall with 6 additional bronze statues of combat era soldiers with a series of benches, sidewalks and paths, with military helicopter at end of property. This area is designated for the quiet reflection of friends, family, and others as they remember their loved ones who have served in our armed forces is scheduled to be completed by late Summer of 2022.

Other Considerations

Since beginning of project in 2016 through May 2019, over \$393,000 has been received in cash,

donations in-kind and pledges. Over 600 veteran names have been engraved on the wall @ \$200 per engraving. On-going requests or support will continue through project completion and our organization is designed to help fund the memorials and parks in Fairmont, the Martin County seat, and the surrounding Martin County communities. Monies to be spent for goods and services will be to Minnesota businesses, or USA suppliers, whenever possible

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Martin County

Who will operate the facility?

MCVM Committee

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Public will visit our county veterans memorial.

Public Purpose

In addition to recognizing our veterans, the memorial will be an attraction for travelers. The Public will stop, look, remember, honor, and some will pray in quiet reflection of those who served.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Requested and was approved for 100,000 (50,000 each of 2 years 2019 & 2020) from the MN Legacy Fund.

Project Contact Person

Douglas C Landsteiner
Martin County Veteran Service Officer
507-238-3220
doug.landsteiner@co.martin.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$300,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Martin County Veterans Memorial

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$393 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$493 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$42 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$451 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$493 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| McKinley OHV Recreation Park | 1 | GO | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

McKinley OHV Recreation Park

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$250

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of McKinley is requesting a \$250,000 to provide funds for project pre-engineering and architectural tasks to construct an Off- Highway Vehicle Recreation Park (OHVRP). The project seeks to capture the economic benefits that these types of developments have provided communities in NE Minnesota. When completed, the McKinley OHV will provide facilities, with associated outdoor recreation amenities, to over a 25- mile trail system commencing from Virginia to Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota.

Project Description

McKinley officials in coordination with their City Engineer have conducted a project feasibility assessment that identifies the development 30 recreational pad sites complete with water and electrical services. The development would include a registration office with restroom and shower facilities. An Engineers Opinion of Probable Cost estimates a \$2-million project cost. The City of McKinley owns the proposed 20-acre development site.

In addition to State Bonding Bill request, funding sources being pursued include the following:

MN DNR Outdoor Recreation Grant Funds

Federal LAWCON funds

IRRRB Development Infrastructure Funds

St. Louis County CDBG Funds

Applicant Equity

Project Rationale

McKinley is in the heart of NE Minnesota’s popular OHV recreational tourism business. Surrounding communities that have developed OHVRP’s have been successful to the point where the demand for recreation park facilities exceeds the availability of sites. Reservations for these sites book up to a year in advance of their actual use. McKinley’s project will provide an anticipated 30 additional site pads to meet this demand. McKinley is centrally located between similar existing municipally owned facilities and provides the opportunity for expansion of OHV trail systems and connections with existing bike and walking trail systems. These connections will result in over 25 miles of OHV, bike, and walking outdoor recreational opportunities to the tourists seeking these types of recreational pursuits.

Project Timeline

Secure State Bonding Bill Appropriation
 Pursue project funding from all sources
 Pre-design, Engineering, Architecture

Spring 2020
 Fall 2019/Spring 2020
 Fall 2019

Commence with Site Development
Complete Site Development
Project Startup

Summer 2020
Fall 2020
Spring 2021

Other Considerations

Development of the McKinley OHVRP will initiate new development processes of linking existing outdoor recreation services along a corridor that includes 25 miles of trails, recreation vehicle sites, and city services along the corridor. The economic benefit to communities located along the corridor will be significant.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

It is anticipated that following receipt of this request for a State Bonding Bill funds, that McKinley officials will pursue leveraged funds from the following sources to conduct project funding activities:
MNDNR Outdoor Recreation Grant Program
Federal LAWCON funds
Iron Range Rehabilitation and Resource Board
St. Louis County CDBG Funds
Applicant Equity

Who will own the facility?

The City of McKinley will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of McKinley will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be used and occupied by a OHV and outdoor recreation enthusiasts from throughout the upper Midwest.

Public Purpose

The facility will be municipally owned providing economic development opportunities for the City of McKinley that will also result in broad based economic development opportunities to the NE Minnesota and State of Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City of McKinley received a \$1.1 million-dollar Special Appropriation to construct a regional municipal water project connection with the City of Gilbert, MN in 2015.

Project Contact Person

Michelle Claviter-Tveit
Clerk
218-750-0184
cityofmckinley@gmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

McKinley OHV Recreation Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$1,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,925 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | |
| Is the required information included in this request? | |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Melrose Wastewater Treatment Facility | 1 | GO | 5,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Melrose Wastewater Treatment Facility**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$5,750**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Melrose is requesting \$5.75 million to make improvements at the wastewater treatment facility.**Project Description**

The WWTF was originally constructed in 1963/64 and has undergone upgrades and improvements over the years. Many of the components of the current facility are undersized or have outlived their useful life. The facility is nearing treatment capacity and these improvements will expand the capacity and replace aging components. Specifically, these improvements will provide a new preliminary treatment system, with new screening and pumping. It also includes a new clarifier and improvements to solids management.

Project Rationale

Flows to the Melrose wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) are dominated by a few industrial users. Just under 70 percent of the plant's permitted capacity is allocated to industrial users through individual Significant Industrial User (SIU) agreements. These existing industrial customers have requested increases to flow and/or load allocations and other industries have approached the City with an interest in locating in Melrose. With these requests, the projected wastewater flow will be nearing the permitted capacity of the facility.

Project Timeline

Design completed - Spring 2021
 Bid awarded - Summer 2021
 Construction start - Summer 2021
 Project completion - Winter 2022

Other Considerations

As our City billboard says, "We are Growing". Melrose has seen nearly \$200 million worth of building permits over the past eight years. This is due to the construction/expansion of the CentraCare Health - Hospital, CentraCare Health - Melrose Park View Center and Jennie-O Turkey Store, the construction of Arce Auto and Car Sales, Cornerstone Restaurant, Warrior Boats, and the expansions of Melrose Metalworks, Melrose Electric, Carstens Industries, Proliant - Land O'Lakes and Melrose One Stop to name a few. We have also seen remodeling of businesses on our Main Street as well as planned expansions of Casey's Gas Station on the south side of town.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City of Melrose and the Public Utility Commission will be responsible for all annual operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

City of Melrose/Melrose Public Utility Commission

Who will operate the facility?

Melrose Public Utility Commission

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be used by the residents and businesses of Melrose.

Public Purpose

Providing municipal wastewater treatment for the community.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Tessa Beuning
Finance Director
320-256-4278
tbeuning@cityofmelrose.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Melrose Wastewater Treatment Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$5,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Water Main Extension | 1 | GO | 920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2016 Land Slide | 2 | GF | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Water Pressure Reducing Valve | 3 | GF | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 920 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 290 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Water Main Extension**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$920 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | Complete the water main throughout the City of Mendota |

Project Description

Add 4,500 feet to extend the water main throughout the City of Mendota. Estimated costs after consulting with St Paul Water is \$200 per foot.

Project Rationale

Completing the Water Main Extension will allow Mendota residents to have the option to connect to St Paul Water rather than the private well that most residents have. The water quality in Mendota is poor. We lack the necessary fire hydrants to protect our residents.

Project Timeline

As soon as possible.

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

City of Mendota

Who will operate the facility?

St Paul Water

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The residents of Mendota

Public Purpose

To provide a quality water solution. Public protection

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Brian Mielke
Mayor

612-270-9091

bmielke@myservion.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Main Extension

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$920 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$920 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$10 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$10 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$920 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | No |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

2016 Land Slide**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$240**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** Reimburse the City of Mendota for road repairs caused by excessive rain water that happened in June of 2016. The City of Mendota was forced to have a GO Bond to pay for the \$240,000 worth of repair work that ultimately was completed in 2016.**Project Description**

Massive rains caused parts of our roads to collapse in June of 2016. FEMA denied the claims for Dakota County. The State of Minnesota did pay for 75% of the repairs, leaving the City of Mendota to come up with the rest. We did through the sale of GO Bonds and increased our Tax Levy to pay for the bonds.

Project Rationale

The City of Mendota is a low/moderate income City. The increase in our tax level put a large burden on our residents. The City of Mendota does everything possible to keep our Levy low through volunteer help. Any refund available would help us keep our Levy lower and give our residents financial relief.

Project Timeline**Other Considerations****Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?****Who will operate the facility?****Who will use or occupy the facility?****Public Purpose****Description of Previous Appropriations****Project Contact Person**

Brian Mielke
Mayor

612-270-9091

bmielke@myservion.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

2016 Land Slide

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Water Pressure Reducing Valve**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$50**Priority Ranking:** 3

Project Summary: St Paul Water will be installing a water pressure reducing valve on a main that feeds the City of Mendota. The cost to do so is approximately \$50,000, of which the City of Mendota is responsible for 80% of the cost. The City of Mendota cannot bear this type of expense and is asking to be reimbursed the cost of the project that the City of Mendota will have to pay this year.

Project Description

St Paul Water will install a pressure reducing valve that will decrease the water pressure in the City of Mendota.

Project Rationale

With the pressure unusually high, the water main is in jepordy of breaking.

Project Timeline

Summer of 2019

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

St Paul Water

Who will operate the facility?

St Paul Water

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Mendota

Public Purpose

Protect and extend the life of a water main that the City is 100% reliant upon as water only comes into the City from the south. If the water main broke, those relying upon the water would be cut off until the repairs are made.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Brian D Mielke
Mayor
612-270-9091
bmielke@myservion.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Pressure Reducing Valve

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | No |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| 26th Avenue North: Creating Connections in North Minneapolis | 1 | GO | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Water Works Park | 2 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Rounds Missing Link Implementation | 3 | GO | 12,348 | 0 | 0 | 12,348 | 0 | 0 |
| North Commons Regional Vision | 4 | GO | 11,250 | 0 | 0 | 11,250 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 31,598 | 0 | 0 | 26,598 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 31,598 | 0 | 0 | 26,598 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

26th Avenue North: Creating Connections in North Minneapolis

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$3,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: This request is for \$3,000,000 in state bond funding to design and construct a new Mississippi River overlook and access point at the terminus of 26th Ave. N., located in the City of Minneapolis in Hennepin County, along with a trail connection between that access point and the Grand Rounds Trail System at Ole Olson Park.

Project Description

This request would leverage the city’s 26th Avenue North project by creating a river overlook and access point at the Mississippi River, along with a trail connection south to the Grand Rounds at Ole Olson Park. Trail users will be able to continue south into the already complete portion of the city-wide trail system that begins at Ole Olson Park. The total project cost of the 26th Avenue River Access and trail connection is \$4,500,000, which includes land acquisition, design and construction of pedestrian and bicycle routes from the end of 26th Avenue to Ole Olson Park, an interpretive river overlook / fishing area, and a direct water access. The \$3,000,000 bond request would be leveraged with \$1,500,000 in private philanthropy.

Though the trail gap in this location is only about 1/4 mile, making this connection would provide North Minneapolis with comprehensive access to the 50+ mile trail system.

The proposed improvements along 26th Ave. N. are strongly supported by local residents and partner agencies. This state bond funding would augment other funding sources and partner-agency projects.

Project Rationale

This project would complete a connection between north Minneapolis neighborhoods and the Mississippi River, capitalizing on work completed by the City of Minneapolis along the length of 26th Avenue N. between Theodore Wirth Regional Park and the Mississippi River. For decades, safe and continuous connections between residential areas of north Minneapolis and the Mississippi River have been limited by I-94, which slices through the city and creates a formidable barrier. Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements on 26th Ave. N. will contribute to ongoing community revitalization, and would link to a larger network of existing and planned bicycle facilities on both sides of the river: Lyndale Ave. N. Bikeway, 2nd St. N. Bikeway, future West River Parkway trails, Lowry Ave. Bikeway, Marshall Street Bikeway, 18th Ave NE Bikeway, etc.

The City’s 26th Avenue N. project stops just short of the river, so this project is critical in extending that important work eastward to the Mississippi and connecting it into larger recreational trail loops provided by the existing MPRB trail system. The north side has never had the same kind of natural-resource-based loop trails as the south and southwest portions of the city. Closing this small trail gap with a signature riverside amenity will ameliorate this inequity.

This project will promote creation of 60 jobs in construction and parks operations. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) estimates that approximately 20 new jobs are created for every \$1,000,000 invested in parks and recreation. Parks also help to stabilize land values and encourage neighborhood reinvestment.

Project Timeline

Design Development (funded through private donation prior to bond authorization): 2019
Construction Plans and Bidding: 2020
Construction: July 2020 through December 2021

Other Considerations

This bond request leverages a match of \$1,500,000 in private donations.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy the facility?

none

Public Purpose

Trails, river access

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparcs.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$3 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

26th Avenue North: Creating Connections in North Minneapolis

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | \$1,500 | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$1,500 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$225 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$100 | \$120 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$1,175 | \$2,880 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,500 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Water Works Park

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$5,000

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: This \$5 million funding request is for construction and associated soft costs of the second (Riverside) phase of Water Works, a \$10.2 million park development project on the downtown Minneapolis riverfront overlooking St. Anthony Falls. Funds granted through this request will be equally matched by philanthropic, MPRB, and third-party sources. Archeological analysis, construction documents and permitting will begin in 2018 with construction scheduled for 2021 and an opening to the public in 2022.

Project Description

Water Works is a signature riverfront park project located at the historic genesis of Minneapolis and the only waterfall on the Mississippi River: St. Anthony Falls. The setting is the Minneapolis milling district once called the “grain milling capital of the world.” It is chock full of stone mill ruins, abandoned water power canals, railroad remnants, and a partially-developed park that receives 2.5 million visits a year (and growing fast).

The visionary design for Water Works, which was recently adopted by the MPRB, is a vibrant mix of recreation, ecology, and cultural heritage. The design embraces the complexity of its landscape to celebrate the past and anticipate the future of this important public space.

The project will be constructed in two major phases, called the Mezzanine Phase and the Riverside Phase. The Mezzanine Phase includes all the land between the existing West River Parkway and the adjacent city streets. It will be under construction in 2017 and is funded by MPRB with leveraged private philanthropy. The Riverside Phase includes all the land between the parkway and the Mississippi River. This is the phase for which this state bonding request is being made.

The Riverside phase of Water Works includes:

- Redesigned pedestrian and bike trails.
- Excavation and restoration of the Cataract Mill ruins for use as a plaza.
- Excavation of the water power gatehouse in a way that creates a terraced plaza for events/performances and interactive fountain features.
- Creation of a canoe/kayak landing or general river access point. Shoreline enhancements that combine exposure of a historic seawall with shoreline naturalization.
- Landscape enhancements focused on visitor experience, historic interpretation and riverfront habitat.

Project Rationale

Project Rationale

The Water Works area experienced its first phase of park development by the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board (MPRB) in the 1990s with the creation of Mill Ruins Park. Park development was based on a compelling park vision that, among other things, extended West River Parkway, converted the Stone Arch Bridge to a trail, and exposed some of the many existing mill ruins to interpret the water power story of Minneapolis' milling history.

Since its inception as a park, Mill Ruins has gone from non-use to the epicenter of the fourth most visited park in the entire metropolitan area (Central Mississippi Riverfront Regional Park). The most recent counts in 2015 by the Metropolitan Council estimated 2.1 million visits to the Central Mississippi Riverfront Regional Park.

In its current state of only interim build-out and substantial use, the park is quickly becoming overburdened and its visitor experience lacking. There is no clear point of arrival to the park. There are few visitor services. Trails and historic interpretation are the only recreational offerings. Many of the exposed Mill Ruins are severely decayed. The bustling trail system is disjointed and confusing.

Despite these shortcomings, people are drawn to the Water Works area. It is a fascinatingly complex cultural landscape that captivates its visitors. The park, with the Stone Arch Bridge as its backdrop has also taken the helm as one of most iconic settings in Minnesota. One can only wonder how prominent a place it will be, the number of people who will visit, and how long their visits will last when the park is built to truly celebrate its setting and genuinely accommodate an audience.

Project Timeline

Project initiation: November 2020

Design development and construction plans: 2021 through end of 2022

Construction: 2023 and 2024

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Public Purpose

Trails, education, historic interpretation, events, natural feature viewing, water access.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No direct state bonding has been provided for either the Mezzanine nor the Riverside Phase of the project. However, MPRB has used a portion of its allocation of Regional Park funds (which are

Metropolitan Council and State bond) and Parks and Trails Legacy funds for the Mezzanine Phase of the project. The total allocation from these two funding sources is \$2.8 million.

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparcs.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Works Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | \$4,100 | | | |
| | \$935 | | | |
| | \$15,500 | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$20,535 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$315 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$1,450 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$1,300 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$17,470 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$20,535 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | No |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | |

Grand Rounds Missing Link Implementation

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$12,348

Priority Ranking: 3

Project Summary: This request is for \$12,348,000 in state bond funding to implement portions of the Minneapolis Grand Rounds, a trail network of national significance.

Project Description

Since the 1880s Minneapolis has envisioned a trail and parkway network that would link the entire city and connect to the entire region. Much of that vision has been implemented, but a significant gap remains: the Missing Link. This key segment in the Minneapolis Grand Rounds would run through northeast and southeast Minneapolis and connect St. Anthony Parkway to the Mississippi River. This request would implement the first phase of development. The project area has been developed with a mix of commercial, industrial, institutional, public, and residential uses. The addition of this trail and parkway link would add a regional trail and trailside amenities to areas that have been historically underserved by parks. The first phase of developing the Grand Rounds Missing Link includes:-- The northern Industrial Boulevard segment-- The southernmost segment along 27th Avenue SE-- Trail facilities through the Towerside development area in Prospect ParkMPRB has worked for years to develop the partnerships necessary to bring these early implementations forward. Partnerships with the City of Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, neighborhood organizations, and private developers have set the table for the Missing Link's long awaited implementation.

Project Rationale

The Minneapolis Grand Rounds is a regional network that was always meant to connect the city together. The conspicuous gap in northeast and southeast Minneapolis must be closed, in order to ensure equitable access to this trail system of state and national significance. In the development of its equity metrics for capital improvements, MPRB has committed to allocating one-quarter of all its regional funds to the incomplete portions of the Grand Rounds. The local will exists to see this segment complete, more than 100 years after it was envisioned.

This project will connect northeast Minneapolis--historically underserved by parks and trails--to the Mississippi River. It will connect people throughout Minneapolis and the region to living wage jobs in the commercial and industrial areas that flank the corridor, and it will allow that connection to happen through safe, non-motorized means, thereby having a positive impact on carbon emissions if the region. It will create green spaces and habitat corridors in a heavily paved portion of the region.

The Grand Rounds was a visionary idea in the 1880s and it has driven the region forward economically, socially, and environmentally. It is time to complete that vision by closing the Missing Link.

Project Timeline

Land Acquisition and Detailed Design: July 2020 - December 2021

Construction Plans: November 2021 - April 2022
Construction: April 2022 - December 2023

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and the City of Minneapolis (some public right-of-way will be used for locating trail corridors)

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Public Purpose

Parks and recreation, trails

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparcs.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$12.348 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Grand Rounds Missing Link Implementation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$12,348 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$100 | \$450 | \$2,070 | \$1,263 |
| City Funds | \$1,145 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | \$0 | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$1,245 | \$12,798 | \$2,070 | \$1,263 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$167 | \$1,175 | \$41 | \$14 |
| Project Management | \$55 | \$250 | \$50 | \$30 |
| Construction | \$1,023 | \$10,373 | \$1,979 | \$1,219 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,245 | \$12,798 | \$2,070 | \$1,263 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | No |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

North Commons Regional Vision

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$11,250

Priority Ranking: 4

Project Summary: This request is for \$11,250,000 to begin implementation of a major vision for North Commons Park in Minneapolis that will serve as a regional destination for sports, arts, and community.

Project Description

This request would create a new and exciting recreation and arts space at North Commons Park that will serve the entire northside and welcome the state and region during arts happenings, sports tournaments, and community gatherings. This community-driven vision was established during the North Service Area Master Plan process and was adopted by the Park Board of Commissioners.

Community advocates are currently working to build coalitions around the implementation of the vision and raise funds to contribute to the project. This request would be a first phase of implementation and assumes significant community match to go along with the \$1.8 million allocated in MPRB’s CIP. The request asks for 60% of the funding for several core elements of the North Commons Master Plan, including:

- A new community building with indoor sports, gathering, and arts spaces
- Renovation and relocation of the water-park, a critical recreational amenity for fun and safety through swimming lessons.

This first phase would lay the groundwork for implementation of other regional amenities, none of which are available to the general public in Minneapolis, such as:

- An outdoor refrigerated ice skating and hockey rink
- A seasonal sports dome with artificial turf field

Project Rationale

Minneapolis and its first ring suburbs compete with the outer suburban ring for youth activities, community gathering spaces, and high quality sports venues. Without excellent facilities, regional and state residents have no reason to come to Minneapolis’s vibrant north side, and therefore the north side never sees economic benefits associated with regional sports tournaments and other major draws. The funds flow out of the north side--never in. North side Minneapolis kids have to travel long distances for tournaments and never get to host their own. Because of the ongoing needs of Minneapolis’s much older park system, new facilities that compete with the rest of the region have been difficult to implement. State funding is requested to bridge the gap, or level the playing field, between those who live in the city and those who live elsewhere.

Furthermore, a facility like this, being high quality and desirable to youth, will serve as a safe place for Minneapolis teens and young adults. North Minneapolis includes many majority minority census tracts. Disparities in success outcomes--such as graduation rates, incarceration rates, wealth, and

chronic disease--between whites and people of color are well known. The lack of places to go, specifically places that positively engage youth, is often partly blamed for these disparities. Investment in the North Commons Vision is an investment in youth success across Minneapolis and the region.

Project Timeline

Design and Construction Plans: 2021
Construction: 2022-2023

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Public Purpose

Parks and recreation, sports, community gathering, arts programming and creation, education

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparcs.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$11.25 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

North Commons Regional Vision

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$11,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$368 | \$800 | \$1,000 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$5,332 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$368 | \$17,382 | \$1,000 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$368 | \$360 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$105 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$14,395 | \$855 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,522 | \$145 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$368 | \$17,382 | \$1,000 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Upper Harbor Outdoor Music Performance Venue | 1 | GO | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Central City Storm Tunnel | 2 | GO | 19,000 | 0 | 0 | 19,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement | 3 | GF | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 41,500 | 0 | 0 | 19,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 39,000 | 0 | 0 | 19,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Upper Harbor Outdoor Music Performance Venue

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$20,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$20 million in State funds is requested by the City of Minneapolis to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new outdoor music performance venue to be located in Minneapolis. |

Project Description

The proposed project is a new outdoor music performance venue on the Upper Harbor site along the Mississippi River in north Minneapolis. The design concept for the venue will be refined with community input over the remainder of 2019.

The music venue site will be about 150,050 sq. ft. The venue will accommodate up to about 9,000 people in a combination of: up to 5,400 people in an inner lawn that can be used for temporary seating (3,700) or standing room (5,400), 3,600 permanent seats in a 58,600 sq. ft. elevated gantry structure and box suites. Additional standing room for large events will be available on the adjacent outer lawn area. The stage structure is expected to be about 20,200 sq. ft., with an adjacent 21,300 sq. ft. back-of-house structure. The stage will be designed to allow it to be enclosed for smaller events on a year-round basis.

As outlined in more detail in the Project Costs screen, the estimated total cost project is \$42,500,000. The State funding will be matched with funds from several sources, including about \$12,600,000 in philanthropic donations; \$5,500,000 in private funds invested by the venue operator (some or all of which may be funded with revenue bonds); and \$4,400,000 in New Market Tax Credits.

Project Rationale

The music venue will fill a long-standing need for a permanent outdoor venue of this size in the Minneapolis St. Paul metropolitan area, allowing the metro area to benefit from performers who have been skipping this market due to the lack of an appropriate venue. All other existing venues within an hour's drive of the metro are either much smaller, much larger or only provide temporary facilities that do not provide a quality experience for attendees.

The venue, along with the planned riverfront regional park improvements, will serve as a centerpiece for the planned redevelopment of the Upper Harbor site and act as the catalyst to support adjacent development that will benefit both north Minneapolis and the entire metro region.

Project Timeline

Some of the predesign investments that will be funded by local match will occur through 2019 and early 2020. Assuming approval in spring 2020 of the requested State bond grant, design and then bidding will follow, with the goal of encumbering the State funds and starting construction in 2021. Completion of construction is expected to be in time to allow performances to begin in 2022.

The planning, design work, and construction of the music venue will be closely coordinated with the Phase 1 park and public improvements to be completed by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and City of Minneapolis using the bond appropriation approved in 2018.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Minneapolis will have a long-term real estate interest in the venue site through a lease with a term equal to at least 125% of the Useful Life of the music venue. The lessor will be either First Avenue Productions or a new entity created by First Avenue.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Minneapolis will have a lease/use agreement with the First Avenue entity under which the entity will operate the facility on behalf of the City.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

As noted, the First Avenue entity will oversee use of the music venue on behalf of the City of Minneapolis pursuant to a lease/use agreement. In addition to First Avenue's own ticketed programming by a wide variety of types of performers, a number of other entities have expressed interest in using the venue for their programming. These performances will attract residents from the metro region and beyond and will provide a state-wide benefit. As part of the lease/use agreement, First Avenue also will be required to provide a robust program of free community programming that will benefit the adjacent north Minneapolis community and will be curated/controlled by a north Minneapolis community-based partner. When the venue is not being used for ticketed or free programming, the open areas of the facility (e.g., the inner lawn) will be open for informal use as an extension of the adjacent public park areas.

Public Purpose

The public purposes for the new music venue will include: a) provision of a cultural amenity for the entire state and for a community that is lacking in publicly-owned cultural asset investments, and b) catalyst for redevelopment of what is currently a blighted site in a disadvantaged portion of Minneapolis that suffers from extensive disparities and disinvestment. In addition to the free community programming noted above, the lease/use agreement between the City of Minneapolis and the First Avenue entity also will require other community benefits for north Minneapolis, e.g., youth employment through the City's Step Up program, and training and mentorship for area youth through participation on a Youth Advisory Council that will participate in programming and operation. The facility's operator has also committed to intentional procurement initiatives designed to create business opportunities for local entrepreneurs via the venue's purchasing.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$15,000,000 was appropriated in 2018 to the City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board for the construction of Phase 1 public and park improvements for the Upper Harbor site. Through 2019 and 2020, the City and MPRB will be funding the necessary design and engineering with local funds and bidding the work, with the goal of encumbering the State funds and starting construction by 2021.

No funds have been appropriated specifically for the music venue at the Upper Harbor.

Project Contact Person

Erik Hansen
Director of Economic Policy and Development
612-673-5159
erik.hansen@minneapolismn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Upper Harbor Outdoor Music Performance Venue

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$22,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$42,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$37,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$42,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Central City Storm Tunnel

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$19,000

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: The Central City tunnel consists of 4 miles of deep stormwater drainage underneath downtown Minneapolis. The project will facilitate the design and construction of additional hydraulic capacity in the tunnel which is necessary to: reduce pressurization by increasing the capacity, reduce risks of tunnel failure, reduce tunnel repair costs, and address challenges such as surface flooding and blowing manhole covers.

Project Description

The Central City Tunnel is part of a larger 16-mile network of stormwater tunnels that underlay the City of Minneapolis. The tunnels play a critical part of the City's stormwater system. They are designed to convey stormwater from some of the most developed parts of the city. The storm tunnel network, like much of the City's other underground water infrastructure, is aging. The scope of the project is a 0.75-mile segment close to the Mississippi River that collects stormwater from upstream tunnel branches running under the downtown streets. This segment of tunnel built in the 1880s and 1930s is currently very undersized. The selected option to increase hydraulic capacity is to add a parallel tunnel alongside the existing main outlet tunnel. Currently this existing tunnel segment has a capacity volume of approximately 160,000 cubic feet. By adding a new parallel tunnel to the existing sections we would increase the capacity volume to 700,000 cubic feet, an increase of over 400% which would allow the tunnel to reach 100 year storm service levels throughout most of the system. This increased capacity would provide a cross-sectional area that would allow for the water in the feeder tunnels to exit more quickly, which would decrease the head pressures in these tunnels, diminishing the risk of damage and costs due to pressurization, and reduce the potential for sanitary releases into the river.

Project Rationale

The oldest tunnels in the City, including the segment of the Central City Tunnel covered by this project, date back to the late 1800s. The tunnels were constructed to facilitate drainage and development by collecting storm water from the smaller pipes and conveying it to the Mississippi River. The Central City Tunnel is located 65 to 100 feet below the surface in sandstone formation. The City's storm tunnels together with the rest of the system have served the municipality well, however, they are deteriorating. Land development and an increase in storm frequency and intensity since have led to a significant increase in the amount of stormwater directed to the tunnel and a pressurized system.

Together with complementary Mn/DOT storm tunnels combined, the tunnels drain approximately 10,000 acres or 27% of the City. The need for the project was identified following a failure of the tunnel liner in 2010 that compromised a nearby sanitary sewer and led to a discharge of untreated wastewater and stormwater to the Mississippi River. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$38 million.

Project Timeline

Feasibility Study completed 2017
Design and engineering 2018-2019
Construction 2020-2023

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

None.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Minneapolis will own the tunnel and be responsible for operation and maintenance.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Minneapolis will own the tunnel and be responsible for operation and maintenance.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The City of Minneapolis will own the tunnel and be responsible for operation and maintenance.

Public Purpose

Facilitate public safety through adequate drainage of downtown Minneapolis. The tunnel is not only a vital piece of Minneapolis infrastructure but also supports regional growth and development. Some of Minnesota's largest companies with national and international significance are headquartered in the area of the City that drains to the tunnel including; Target, Wells Fargo, U.S. Bank Corp, Valspar, Capella, and Xcel Energy. The drainage area of the tunnel also includes Orchestra Hall, the Hennepin County Government Center, and the U.S. Court House Building all of which serve communities far beyond Minneapolis.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The project has not received previous state appropriations.

Project Contact Person

Lisa Cerney
City Engineer/Deputy Director Public Works
612-673-3061
lisa.cerney@minneapolismn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$19 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Central City Storm Tunnel

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$19,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$19,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$38,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$35,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$38,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,500 |
| Priority Ranking: | 3 |
| Project Summary: | \$2.5 million in state funds is requested to develop owned land for specialty training in rail response, gas and electrical emergencies, technical rescue and tactical law enforcement. Location of project is at 25 37th Ave NE. The land necessary to complete this project has already been purchased by the City of Minneapolis and donated to the Minneapolis Fire Department. The assessed value of this land is \$1,287,400. |

Project Description

The Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) is a multi-agency public safety facility currently used to train first responders, fire professionals, law enforcement officials, technical rescue and hazardous materials specialists, as well as state and federal incident management personnel. The land is located in Anoka County, the City of Fridley, and operated by the City of Minneapolis, housing Minneapolis Fire Training, Emergency Management and Police Strategic Intelligence. The total project cost is \$5.0 million.

The intent of this project is to develop unused, city-owned property located between the Minneapolis Water Works and the Emergency Operations Training Facility. This 1.5 acre parcel at 25 37th Ave NE, along with existing land and facilities, is ripe for development and expansion. When completed, the facility will address several areas of immediate need - large-scale transportation response, agency interoperability, tactical law enforcement, technical and structural collapse rescue. All of these training needs may be filled for multiple jurisdictions with this single project. While funds have been allocated to multiple training facilities across the metro and state, including Camp Ripley, none of these facilities provide the base-level, repetitive skill training in these areas that this proposed expansion can provide.

The core of this concept is an initial focus on resettable, adjustable structures such as mock building components that allow for training in short durations, with little set-up or breakdown time. Such modular structures also provide a safe, secure environment to learn skills from the most basic level through advanced training. There is nothing similar to this in the regional or the surrounding multi-state area, and the potential user list is long. A facility centrally located in the metropolitan area that can provide this wide array of training opportunities for dozens of jurisdictions is a cost and time-effective way to progressively develop skills. In conversations during conceptualization the following agencies have indicated strong verbal interest in such a site:

- BNSF Rail
- CP Rail
- Xcel Energy
- CenterPoint Energy
- Minneapolis Police

- Minneapolis Public Works
- St. Paul Fire
- St. Paul Police
- University of Minnesota Police
- MN Department of Public Safety
- MN State Fire Marshal's Office
- MN Task Force 1
- MN Bomb Squad
- MN Air Rescue
- MN State Patrol
- 55th CST

The support of each of these partners, whether that be in the form of user agreement or private financial/material contribution, demonstrates the clear need and the likely realization of such a project.

Project Rationale

Today, the increase in transportation of hazardous materials by rail, coupled with the on-going challenges of infrastructure, human-related and weather-related emergencies, dictate a higher level of preparedness for service providers, first responders, emergency planners and municipal leaders.

Furthermore, the recent and expected future growth of the metropolitan area, and the development of large venue structures and scheduled high profile events that accompanies this growth, creates obvious target hazard sites.

To proactively counter these new realities, a collaborative, all-hazards approach to planning and training is required, along with a facility that directly enhances the response skills of multiple partners - local, metropolitan, state and federal public safety, utility providers, and transportation agencies.

Project Timeline

Final Design: Winter 2020/2021

Bid Letting: March 2021

Groundbreaking: July 2021

Project Complete: Fall 2021

Other Considerations

- The EOTF is the training facility for 27 regional fire departments and emergency response units, as well as four private partner users. It also serves as the mobilization point and training location for Minnesota Task Force One, a highly trained multi-jurisdictional team of firefighters and paramedics from the cities of: Edina, St. Paul, Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Rochester, and Dakota County, that serve the State.
- Task Force One is equipped to handle structural collapses, and breaking reinforced concrete and steel, trench rescues and confined space rescues. The training prepares rescuers to perform as hazmat/technicians/specialists.
- The proposed improvements will be available training of fire departments throughout the region and

state, and public utility personnel.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

City of Minneapolis

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Fire Department

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be available for use for first responders and emergency personnel from other jurisdictions such as: Minneapolis Police; Minneapolis Public Works; St. Paul Fire; St. Paul Police; University of Minnesota Police; MN Department of Public Safety; MN State Fire Marshal's Office; MN Task Force One; MN Bomb Squad; MN Air Rescue; MN State Patrol; 55th CST; Golden Valley; Spring Lake Park; Moundsview; Roseville; Vadnais Heights; St. Anthony; Lake Johanna; Maplewood; Bloomington; Richfield.

Public Purpose

Training of first responders, public safety officials, utility and transportation employees in the specialty areas of technical rope, confined space, trench and structural collapse rescue, as well as utility and rail emergencies. Training can be given at base (awareness) level through advanced (technician) level, and will cover a broad base from public civil service and public safety, industry service providers, and state emergency responders.

A metro location where skills may be practiced, repeated, and honed is vital. Annual or biannual training at large statewide complexes is needed. But without access to a facility to develop skills, the utility of a statewide location to demonstrate these skills will be limited.

It is envisioned that such a regional facility will compliment and increase the utility of larger, statewide training facilities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

- Laws 2010 Chapter 189 Section 14 Subdivision appropriated \$750,000 for the design and construction of the EOTF.
- City has received direct federal and passthrough grants for the construction and equipping of the EOTF. The grants were received in 2010 and 2011.

Project Contact Person

John Fruetel and Raymond Cruz
Fire Chief and Deputy Chief
612-673-2536
john.fruetel@minneapolismn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

(\$ in thousands)

Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$450 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|--------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| 11th St Railroad Grade Separation | 1 | THB | 57,555 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Moorhead Community and Aquatics Center | 2 | GO | 9,500 | 11,500 | 0 | 9,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 67,055 | 11,500 | 0 | 9,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 57,555 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 9,500 | 11,500 | 0 | 9,500 | 0 | 0 |

11th St Railroad Grade Separation**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$57,555 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$57.555 million in State funds is requested to complete final design, property acquisition, utility relocation, and construction of the 11th St Railroad Grade Separation Project in the City of Moorhead. |

Project Description

The City of Moorhead is bisected by five active freight rail lines. The 11th St, 1st Ave N, and Main Ave corridors are currently four-lane urban minor arterials. Center Ave (currently designated as State Trunk Highway [TH] 10/75) is a four-lane principal arterial, and is part of the National Highway System. All intersections within the Downtown project area are currently signalized but suffer from severe congestion related to train-induced delay.

The Moorhead Downtown Grade Separation Study (2016) considered the feasibility of a grade separation in Downtown Moorhead and identified 11th St as the most technically feasible location.

The 11th St Railroad Grade Separation Project proposes the construction of two railroad grade separations (underpasses) in Downtown Moorhead. The project would construct two separate railroad bridges to carry the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline and the BNSF Railway Prosper Subdivision tracks over 11th St which intersects Main Ave, Center Ave (TH 10/75), and 1st Ave N. The project is consistent with a plan to shift TH 10/75 from its current at-grade crossing of the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline at 8th St to 11th St providing significant benefits to the Trunk Highway system.

The project will enable high volumes of vehicular traffic, emergency services vehicles, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles to safely and efficiently pass below bridges that will carry these two freight rail lines. The project includes construction of sidewalks and trails to close gaps in the metropolitan bicycle/pedestrian system and greatly improve bicycle/pedestrian safety. Finally, the project includes the construction of various ancillary improvements such as stormwater pump stations, ponds, and related utility relocations.

The total cost to construct the project is estimated to be \$80.555 million. The City is requesting capital budget funding assistance in the amount of \$57.555 million which, combined with \$18.0 million in Trunk Highway funds, \$3.0 million in City funds, \$0.5 million in Clay County funds, and an anticipated \$1.5 million statutory cost-share (5% of the bridge structure costs) from BNSF Railway, will be used for the following activities:

- Property acquisition: \$13.000 million
- Final design: \$2.260 million
- Utility relocation and project construction: \$63.035 million
- Construction observation/contract administration: \$2.260 million

Project Rationale

The 11th St Railroad Grade Separation Project is designed to alleviate train-induced delays and conflicts experienced by motorized and non-motorized traffic. The need for the project has been identified in multiple planning documents.

- Improvements to Highway-Rail Grade Crossings and Rail Safety (MnDOT, 2014), compiled from findings indicating chronic and prolonged grade crossing blockages on high traffic rail corridors which pose a substantial risk for emergency responders and the community, identified the project as a high priority.
- Moorhead Downtown Grade Separation Study (Metro COG, 2016) which considered the feasibility of a grade separation in Downtown Moorhead and identified 11th Street as the most technically feasible location.
- Statewide Rail Plan (MnDOT, 2015 draft) which identified the project as the foremost rail safety need on the BNSF KO Subdivision between Moorhead and St. Paul.
- Long Range Transportation Plan for the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan area (Metro COG, 2014).

The Minnesota Comprehensive Statewide Freight and Passenger Rail Plan (MnDOT, 2010) and the North Dakota State Freight Plan (NDDOT, 2014) indicate that freight demands will continue to increase train traffic. By 2040, the number of through-trains passing through the City is projected to increase to 151 per day which, when combined with switching movements, results in 187 highway-rail crossing blockages per day. Existing and projected train activity, including numerous shipments of oil and other hazardous materials, at the nine at-grade crossings in Downtown Moorhead negatively affects vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic safety and operations; is a barrier to emergency services and first responders; and is detrimental to quality of life and economic vitality. These negative impacts are magnified by a variety of border city economic and competitive disparities including, but not limited to, significant investments in infrastructure.

The 11th Street Railroad Grade Separation Project will improve transportation system reliability, mobility, and connectivity. The project provides numerous regional and local transportation, economic, and public safety benefits:

- The project improves regional and local transportation system connectivity and continuity. 11th St serves as a primary north-south corridor with segments in the project area designated as a County State Aid Highway (Clay County) and a Municipal State Aid Street (City of Moorhead). With the project, train-related delay in 2040 is projected to be reduced from 488 to 253 vehicle-hours per day (48 percent reduction).
- The project reduces crossing exposure and minimizes the risk of train/vehicle accidents. Daily railroad crossing exposures in 2040 are projected to be reduced from approximately 4,000,000 to approximately 2,100,000 (48 percent reduction).
- The project improves connectivity and operations for MnDOT TH 10 and TH 75, which are part of the National Highway System. Although the TH 10/75 designation currently follows an 8th St alignment across the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline, a plan has been developed to shift the TH 10/75 designation to follow Main Ave to 11th St and cross the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline at that location. Therefore, the TH 10/75 designation would follow the eventual location for a grade separation in Downtown Moorhead.
- The project reduces train-induced vehicle delay, which exceeds the recommended threshold in the FHWA Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook for both existing and future conditions. Network-wide delay in 2040 is projected to be reduced by approximately 17% during the AM peak hour, and 28% during the PM peak hour.
- The project improves emergency response times and increases response time reliability.

Emergency responders traveling north-south across the KO and/or Prosper Subdivision tracks experience the same delays caused by train blockages as vehicular traffic along at-grade crossings. This is a concern for the City fire station along 1st Ave N and FM Ambulance station along Main Ave, which are near the Prosper and KO Subdivisions, respectively. Moorhead Fire & Rescue experiences an average of nine delayed response times per month due to trains blocking railroad crossings. With an average delay per train at the BNSF KO and BNSF Prosper lines of 3.9 minutes and 5.9 minutes, respectively, these impacts confound efforts to meet the accepted industry standard of a four minute response 90% of the time and can have fatal consequences. In addition, the Moorhead Police Department and Clay County Sheriff's Department are located just north of Downtown Moorhead along 11th St.

- The project improves Metro Area Transit (MATBUS) service by eliminating street system discontinuity, providing for more fluid north-south transit operations, and improving schedule reliability.
- The project improves connectivity for non-motorized transportation users, including bicycles and pedestrians, that are most acutely affected by changes in distance traveled.
- The project allows the City to confidently plan for future development and reinvestment in the Downtown area which was designated an Opportunity Zone by the US Treasury in 2018. More than 40% of the property in this area is currently underutilized and holds the potential for more than \$113 million in additional property value and more than 1,300 jobs. The project removes concerns regarding safety and traffic mobility within Downtown Moorhead and improves the opportunity for private sector reinvestment and business development.

Project Timeline

Preliminary engineering and environmental assessment were initiated in late 2018 and will be complete in early 2020. Final design and property acquisition would be initiated in July 2020. Utility relocation and project construction could begin by July 2022 and be complete by July 2025.

Other Considerations

The costs associated with the documented need for railroad grade separation projects within the City of Moorhead, which provide regional benefits, are far beyond the City's local financial capacity. The proposed local match for the project is within the local capability.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The project will not result in a need for new or additional State operating funds or impact State operating subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

City of Moorhead, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Moorhead, MN

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The project will benefit, and be used by, the traveling public.

Public Purpose

The project will improve transportation system safety, reliability, mobility, and connectivity by eliminating conflicts between trains, automobiles, trucks, buses, emergency services vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. The project will directly improve regional economic vitality, community safety, and quality of life.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Work to date includes no previous appropriations of state capital budget funds.

Project Contact Person

Chris Volkers
City Manager
218-299-5308
chris.volkers@ci.moorhead.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$110 million in trunk highway bonds for grants to projects on the Department of Transportation's 2014 Crude by Rail Grade Crossing Study.

(\$ in thousands)

11th St Railroad Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$57,555 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Cash | \$562 | \$18,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| | \$141 | | | |
| City Funds | \$587 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,290 | \$80,555 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$13,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$1,290 | \$4,520 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$45,203 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$17,832 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,290 | \$80,555 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Moorhead Community and Aquatics Center

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$9,500**Priority Ranking:** 2

Project Summary: The Moorhead Community & Aquatics Center (MCAC) will be a community-focused wellness facility owned & operated by the City of Moorhead with expected use by the Moorhead Area Public Schools, higher education, swim clubs, and community partners. The facility includes a 50-meter, competition-sized pool & diving area, exercise areas, community gathering spaces, senior spaces, child care, and an outdoor splash pad.

Project Description

The MCAC will be a \$25M facility consisting of up to a 100K square foot building. A number of publicly-owned sites have been identified for a potential location and the City is working on a final choice.

Amenities will include:

- A 50-meter, competition-sized swimming pool as the cornerstone for the facility (includes 8 lanes & diving area)
- Modern fitness facilities with exercise spaces (including flexible space and equipment for adaptive recreation)
- Locker rooms accommodating adults, all-ages, families, and special needs
- Fully licensed childcare center
- Teens and seniors spaces
- Multipurpose gathering spaces with café including public meeting spaces

A key decision in the predesign process that allows the facility to maximize the budget is the ability to coordinate construction with the substantial renovation and expansion of Moorhead High School, a long-term lease for use of this new facility by Moorhead Area Public Schools, securing a stable operating revenue for the facility.

The MCAC will be owned and operated by the City of Moorhead. There will be opportunities for partnerships with schools and non-profit organizations in the area for operational assistance (i.e. child care). The project has broad support with endorsements from businesses, Clay County, the City of Moorhead, Moorhead Area Public Schools, and area higher education institutions. MCAC will serve students and other Moorhead residents, with expanding reach for regional competitions, events, and activities. MCAC will help Moorhead make a measurable improvement in community health outcomes. Our relationships with the State, City, School District, higher education institutions, private sector operators, and capital campaign donors are overwhelmingly strong and will continue to grow with the potential that this project will bring to building a healthy and thriving Moorhead.

Project Rationale

Moorhead is a growing community of 43,440, with a population increase of 14% since 2010, and a projected population of 59,100 by 2040. Moorhead residents (median age 29.7) need public spaces for aquatics and other recreation, child care, nonprofit activity and training spaces for all ages and abilities. Health and wellness opportunities are important considerations for all communities, and with long winters and harsh weather conditions, indoor gathering and recreation opportunities are especially important to the wellbeing of Minnesota communities, including Moorhead.

The Moorhead Aquatics and Community Center will serve to improve Moorhead's health outcomes. According to County Health Rankings & Roadmaps, Clay County currently ranks 58 of Minnesota's 87 counties in terms of health outcomes. Moorhead has higher than average premature death, an elevated premature age-adjusted mortality, and lower than average social associations. With a young population, we see no reason why Moorhead couldn't be in the top 10 Minnesota counties in terms of health outcomes.

The facility will consist of multiple amenities in one location to foster fitness, preventative health and wellness, and community connectivity. Discussions with the YMCA for child care, Moorhead Area Public Schools and the higher education institutions for aquatic use, and community service organizations for programming are in process to solidify the programming that will make this facility a catalyst for change to improve the overall health of Moorhead's residents.

Project Timeline

Predesign, Design & Specifications - September 2020

Bids/RFP - January 2021

Bid Award - April 2021

Construction - September 2021 - December 2022

Grand Opening - March 2023

Other Considerations

None

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The facility will be fully operated by the City of Moorhead and operational costs and funding are being identified. Some options include a minimal increase in sales tax. The revenues from this increase is expected to fully fund all operations of the MCAC.

There will be no impact on State operating subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

City of Moorhead

Who will operate the facility?

City of Moorhead

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The citizens of Moorhead, including high school and college students, seniors, and other residents are excited to use the facility. It is hoped that organizational/institutional users of the facility include City of

Moorhead, Moorhead Public Schools, Minnesota State University Moorhead, Concordia College, M|State, YMCA, and Hope, Inc.

Public Purpose

To provide a community based health and wellness facility to proactively combat negative trending health outcomes. Clay County (Moorhead) currently ranks 58 of 87 Minnesota counties in health outcomes. The MCAC will serve as an amenity to encourage community wellness, social association, and community cohesiveness.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous state appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Christina M. Volkers
City Manager
218-299-5303
chris.volkers@cityofmoorhead.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$9.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Moorhead Community and Aquatics Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$9,500 | \$11,500 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$6,215 | \$1,887 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$15,715 | \$13,387 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$625 | \$625 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,875 | \$10,875 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,215 | \$1,887 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$15,715 | \$13,387 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Sanitary Sewer Mainline Lining, Service Lining, and Manhole Sealing | 1 | GO | 4,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Sanitary Sewer Mainline Lining, Service Lining, and Manhole Sealing**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$4,800**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** Completion of the City of Newport's I & I reduction plan focused on installing sanitary sewer service liners on previously lined main-line sewer and lining approximately 10 miles of sanitary sewer mainline pipe and 660 service lines. The total cost of the project is \$9.6 million.**Project Description**

The City of Newport is requesting funding to install a cured in-place liner from the sewer main within the service line toward the residence to a cleanout installed in the boulevard for approximately 860 residential services. Additionally, funding will also be used to install a cured in-place liner in the sanitary sewer main line and service connections in areas of the City sewer system susceptible to infiltration and inflow (I/I). The lining will be applied to approximately 10 miles of deteriorating vitrified clay pipe throughout the City. Ancillary improvements will include chemical grouting and sealing of the 300 sanitary manholes within the project area and boulevard restoration.

Project Rationale

Inflow and infiltration (I/I) can be defined as excess water that flows into sewer pipes as groundwater and surface water runoff. Groundwater (infiltration) seeps into sewer pipes through holes, cracks, joint failures, and faulty connections. Surface water runoff (inflow) rapidly flows into sewers from roof drain downspouts, foundation drains, storm drain cross-connections, and through holes in manholes covers. Most I/I is caused by aging infrastructure that needs maintenance or replacement.

The City of Newport has recently completed (2011) a sewer main-line lining project in this area in an effort to reduce the infiltration and inflow (I/I) into the sanitary sewer system. The City lined approximately 16,500 feet of sanitary mainline pipe servicing 200+ residences. The City has since observed significant I/I entering the mainline at the location of these service lines. During the torrential rains in the Metro Area in June of 2014, the City's wastewater flow increased over 10 times more than the average and the City was levied a surcharge of over \$800,000 by the Metropolitan Council for excessive wastewater peak discharge. To-date, 13.5% of the City's public sewer mains have been lined with cured in-place lining and 10% of private sewer lines and wye connections have been repaired. The City has identified the proposed project area as the worst location in this system for I/I and is requesting funding to help reduce the cost of these improvements.

Project Timeline

This project is to be completed in four (4) phases beginning in 2021. Phase 1 of this project (\$250,000) would aim to address I/I problems to the system servicing the 10th Avenue lift station. This catchment area consists of approximately 1,800 feet of previously lined sewer main and 8 sanitary manholes. By implementing the proposed service lateral liners and manhole grouting improvement to a small isolated area, the City will be able to track the success of their effort in real-time by monitoring the pumping rates for the 10th Avenue Lift Station.

In Phase 2 (\$1,600,000), lining and manhole sealing would shift to the western portion of Newport near the Mississippi River that was also lined during the 2011 lining project. Focusing on the lateral lines and manholes servicing residents in this area would complete the rehabilitation to this portion of this system and reduce clear water issues for many years to come.

The subsequent Phases 3 & 4 (7,750,000) would focus efforts on the remaining portions of Newport east and west of Highway 10/ 61. These areas have not seen much in the way of sewer repairs and are reaching almost 50 years in age. During these phases, both main line sewer and later lines would be rehabilitated via a cured-in-place pipe lining system. Manhole sealing and sewer cleaning and televising would be done as well.

Pricing for each phase was determined by finding a cost per lineal foot of main sewer line serviced by the repairs. Previously completed work in certain areas of the city helped to delineate phasing for this project as well as LF cost of lateral and each manhole.

Other Considerations

The City currently has a very low net taxing capacity due to a per capita levy of over \$700 in addition to an annual sewer rate of \$300 for the average City resident.

The installation of sanitary sewer liners does not require the complete reconstruction of the surrounding infrastructure as required by a full utility replacement. Roads and other public utilities would not be temporarily taken out of service to install a new collection system.

The project proposed herein is a more cost-effective approach than a complete system reconstruction, which would cost an estimated \$27 million.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

The residents of the City of Newport own and maintain their sewer service line from the residence to the sewer main.

Who will operate the facility?

The residents of the City of Newport own and maintain their sewer service line from the residence to the sewer main.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents of the City of Newport.

Public Purpose

The City of Newport has seen unprecedented sewer rate increases from Metropolitan Council Environmental services over the last several years; 25% in 2018 (\$256,300 in 2018 vs. \$200,592 in 2017) and 18% in 2019 (\$302,526 in 2019 vs. \$256,300 in 2018). As a result, the City has raised end-user rates substantially to simply keep up with this escalation. The end-users have little additional capacity to sustain additional rate increases to build the sewer enterprise fund to the level necessary to fund these improvement projects.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Debra Hill
651-459-5677
dhill@newportmn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Sanitary Sewer Mainline Lining, Service Lining, and Manhole Sealing

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$4,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$9,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,652 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$206 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$7,742 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$9,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | No |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | No |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| WELL - Welcome, Education, Library, Livability | 1 | GO | 16,000 | 0 | 0 | 16,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 16,000 | 0 | 0 | 16,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 16,000 | 0 | 0 | 16,000 | 0 | 0 |

WELL - Welcome, Education, Library, Livability

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$16,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Nobles County, along with Independent School District 518 (ISD 518) and the City of Worthington are requesting \$16,000,000 to construct an innovative Resource Center. The new building will house the County Library and Community Services functions, ISD 518 Community Education and the Integration Collaborative, City Recreation Administration and a Welcome Center for new community members.

Project Description

A feasibility study completed by LHB, Inc. of Minneapolis was presented at a public meeting in Worthington on November 7, 2017, concluding that a two-story Resource Center could be successfully constructed and operated on the former Campbell’s Soup property. The total square foot recommendation for the collaborative facility is estimated to be 83,800 gross square feet (a summary of the space is included as Exhibit A). The estimated cost for the construction of the facility is \$36,676,000 (a cost summary is included as Exhibit B), plus, site preparation and FF&E (furniture, fixtures and equipment) which were not estimated as part of the feasibility study. We expect the project will exceed \$40,000,000 with those components included.

The project site is near the center of the city of Worthington, adjacent to an improved trail system, Lake Okabena and the Central Business District. The site was abandoned by the Campbell’s Soup Company in April of 1997, and there is knowledge of some contamination on the property which will be mitigated as a part of the site preparation.

The proposed property is currently owned by the City of Worthington and would be its’ primary contribution to the project along with remodeling of one of the current structures into an indoor field sports recreation building which will be directly attached to the new construction. Nobles County and ISD 518 will share in costs which are above the funding being requested through the bonding bill.

Project Rationale

Each of the primary components of this Resource Center have been in development for several years:

Library

The Nobles County Library has completed significant studies with multiple reviews and revisions since 2007. Each of the studies have concluded the Library needs 28,000 to 32,000 square feet to provide the services and programs appropriate for a community the size of Nobles County, which has a population over 22,000. The Library currently operates out of 8,000 square feet on a site that is not large enough for a major addition to the facility or any way to create adequate parking.

An exhaustive evaluation of potential sites for a new library in Worthington was conducted in 2012 which resulted in identifying fourteen possible building sites. Each was considered for suitability and

each was eliminated for further consideration for a multitude of reasons, including financial. Three additional sites have been considered since that study and none have been suitable for the library until the current option.

Community Education

The ISD 518 Community Education program is where Nobles County’s newest residents, especially the refugee and immigrant community, connect with information, services and educational opportunities. Community Education employs bilingual/bicultural staff to reach out to new residents and to facilitate engagement of individuals, especially people with limited English skills, in appropriate community and school opportunities.

ISD 518 has numerous space constraints. In 2000, the District built a new elementary school with the intent to raze the existing West School because it was beyond its’ useful life, more than 60 years old, and not in a condition that made sense to attempt repairing and remodeling for any other use.

Because of the continued increase in population due primarily to the influx of refugees and immigrants, the deficient West School building is still being used today as the District’s Community Education headquarters with four departments including Adult Basic Education, Community Connectors, Early Childhood Education and Enrichment Programs. These programs have continued to grow to a point ISD 518 moved the Nobles County Integration Collaborative offices out of the West School building to leased space on the west side of the city four years ago.

Welcome Center

In 2013 the Worthington community was awarded a Blandin grant to participate in the Leadership in Ethnically Diverse Communities (LEDC) program for a second time in that program history. One of the top needs identified through the LEDC process was a Welcome Center for newcomers to find all the services available and to assist in their transition to the area. The proposed Resource Center will act like the Community’s living room, bringing together much needed resources for all families in Nobles County, while creating a welcoming environment for our newest residents.

Summary

To date, none of the ideas have been realized due to the high costs of developing individual projects, lack of suitable sites for the facilities or just the right circumstances. For the past five years a successful effort in collaboration across all the governmental and quasi-governmental entities in Nobles County has been developed well.

Through this work, the three primary entities have identified vacant land in a very good location, split costs for a feasibility study for that property, and now have a project identified that can be accomplished much more economically as a single collaborative effort. The property is one block from the proposed Nobles County Historical Society Museum, and just more than one block from both the Worthington City Hall and the Nobles County Government Center. The final key to moving forward with the project is success in obtaining State Bonding Funds. The project will be nearly “Shovel Ready” by the time a decision is made on bond funding allocations by the legislature in the Spring of 2020.

Project Timeline

Project timeline based on successful inclusion in the 2020 state bonding bill:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Summer of 2019: | select the design team |
| Fall of 2019: | complete Schematic Design and select a Construction Manager |
| January-March 2020: | finalize the building design |

April 2020: advertise for a contractor
June 2020: break ground
May 2021: facility ready for occupancy

Other Considerations

This project has the unique opportunity to become a model for collaboration and inclusion for communities across the U.S., and could demonstrate how properly integrating refugees and immigrants into our rural communities can create strong local economies and vibrant neighborhoods. We believe this is the reason Nobles County is one of the only counties in SW Minnesota that continues to grow.

Almost 40 years ago, the residents of Worthington and Nobles County invited Laotian and Vietnamese immigrants into their community to help supply labor for local employers. Unlike many other rural areas at the time, the new residents were truly “welcomed” into the city and county. While other communities shrank and lost their employers, Worthington and Nobles County converted their welcoming attitude into thousands of new residents representing over 80 countries, bringing vitality and energy to all aspects of the community.

The community has experienced success in welcoming refugees and immigrants to Worthington as documented in a study by Barbara Stone which can be found at: <http://www.lifetrack-mn.org/sites/default/files/WelcometoWorthington.pdf>.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Ownership of the newly constructed building will be by Nobles County.

Who will operate the facility?

The Nobles County, City of Worthington and ISD 518 will share in the management responsibilities of operating the facility. All occupants will share in the cost of those services.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The primary occupants of the facility are the Nobles County, the City of Worthington and ISD 518. The county will move Library functions into the building plus some Community Services support functions. The City of Worthington will locate Administrative offices and support functions for the indoor recreation portion of the facility. ISD 518 will move Community Education, new pre-school programs, the Integration Collaborative, Community Connectors offices and classrooms into the new facility. Additional groups that are considering space in the building are the Worthington Chamber of Commerce and related functions, the Worthington Regional Economic Development Corporation whose building is no longer suitable to continue using and the Nobles County Art Center. Each of these organizations is connected directly to at least one of the primary occupants.

Public Purpose

The facility will act as a welcome center for new residents, including refugees and immigrants. The Library functions will offer appropriate technology for job training and research, advancing education, programming and typical functions. ISD 518 focuses on adult and early childhood education and English language classes. All assisting people of different cultures to become more skilled and productive members of the community and region, and, become more engaged in the local

communities. We all understand there is a labor shortage across the U.S. and we in Minnesota need new people to fill many jobs to continue to grow our economy. Worthington is extremely unique in the diversity of residents (Nobles County is currently the second most diverse county in Minnesota by percentage) and the number of countries represented (82 at the 2017 International Festival) in a small county of just more than 22,000 people.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous appropriations have been received for this project.

Project Contact Person

Tom Johnson
County Administrator
507-295-5201
tjohnson@co.nobles.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$16 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

WELL - Welcome, Education, Library, Livability

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$22,826 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$38,826 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,260 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$837 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$32,504 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$325 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$2,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$38,826 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Caswell Park Improvements | 1 | GO | 10,500 | 0 | 0 | 10,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,500 | 0 | 0 | 10,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,500 | 0 | 0 | 10,500 | 0 | 0 |

Caswell Park Improvements

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$10,500**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: \$10.5 million in state funds is requested to complete capital replacements and upgrades to the Caswell Park softball & soccer complex and to expand Caswell Park's local, regional, and statewide benefit by constructing, furnishing, and equipping an indoor field house. The latter project will be located on property owned by the City of North Mankato immediately adjacent to Caswell Park.

Project Description

Total project cost is \$16.5 million dollars. Local revenue available for the project is \$6 million dollars generated from an existing sales and use tax extended by voters in 2016 and approved by the Legislature in 2017. The remaining \$10.5 million dollars needed for the project is requested to come from a state of Minnesota bonding appropriation.

\$3.0 million dollars will complete upgrades to the existing Caswell Regional Sporting Complex (concession upgrades, restroom upgrades, parking lot addition, replace fencing, replace field lights, replace scoreboards, perform necessary site work, increase size of four fields to 300 feet, install knee wall and backstop nettings, provide additional spectator seating, replace the public announcement system, add gateway signage, and install turf field at Caswell North soccer complex. The softball portion of Caswell Park is located on a 27 acre parcel (1,176,120 square feet of which 4,000 square feet is concessions). The soccer portion of Caswell Park is located on a 17.5 acre parcel (762,300 square feet).

\$13.5 million dollars will be used to construct a 90,000 square foot indoor field house. The field house will include four full sized basketball courts and six tennis courts. The basketball portion of the facility can be converted into eight youth sized basketball courts or eight full sized volleyball courts. The tennis courts can be converted into 12 pickle ball courts. Associated support space is included in the 90,000 square feet such as concessions, restrooms, meeting space, and storage (see attached rendering).

More information can be found at <https://www.caswellsports.com/bondingrequest>.

Project Rationale

1. Responds to regional planning efforts
2. Partners with an existing statewide asset
3. Business leaders demanding amenities
4. Local youth sporting demand & partnership with Minnesota State University
5. Positions Mankato/North Mankato region for future prosperity

The Caswell Regional Sporting Complex bonding request is the product of nearly a decade's worth of

regional discussion about recreational needs in the Mankato/North Mankato Metropolitan Statistical Area, successful extension of an existing sales and use tax, and coordinated regional planning. At least three independent feasibility studies have been completed addressing the need for indoor recreational/court space in the area, including one by the Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission. All agree sufficient demand exists for construction of a fieldhouse in an area of the state underserved by this type of asset. Enhancements to the existing park, and the addition of the indoor fieldhouse are critical pieces in a constellation of recreational investments in the Mankato/North Mankato area aimed at strengthening south central Minnesota for future economic and livability success.

Upgrades to the softball and soccer fields at Caswell Park will provide needed enhancements to an existing state asset drawing 35k-55K annual visitors to the area, generating 3-5 million dollars in economic impact, and hosting approximately 35 tournaments a year. In addition, with the national and international rise in popularity of fast pitch softball, Caswell is now hosting international events like the series between the Chicago Bandits and the Beijing Shougang Eagles from China, along with other teams from the National Pro Fastpitch League. In 2019, Caswell is the host site of the winter season for the Australian Olympic Softball team, known locally as the Aussie Peppers for their partnership with the Mankato Peppers youth softball association. As Caswell increases its role as an in and out state draw for sports tourism, upgrades are needed for the thirty plus year old facility. To this date, all costs for construction and improvements have been made by the City of North Mankato.

Conversations with business leaders in the community continue to include reports of difficulties attracting workers of all professional levels to the Mankato/North Mankato Metropolitan Statistical Area due to a lack of indoor amenities like the proposed fieldhouse. As a result, business leaders are demanding these types of investments as a way to attract talent that will help them continue to sustain and grow their companies in the area. The fieldhouse expansion will increase the regional economic impact of Caswell by increasing the number of months the park operates from six to twelve with the addition of indoor winter sports like basketball, volleyball, tennis, and pickleball. In the Mankato/North Mankato area a need exists for additional events hosted in the winter to draw visitors to the area, fill hotels, and provide customers to entertainment oriented businesses. The fieldhouse expansion at Caswell will also address these needs.

Lack of space and available time is continually mentioned by sporting groups looking to invest in local athletes and grow their programs. This lack of space limits regular practice times, performance training, and the ability to host regional tournaments. Numerous examples of citizens traveling into the Twin Cities Metro Area with children to participate in sporting leagues can be offered as a result of the lack of these amenities. The constraints mentioned above induced the area basketball, volleyball, and tennis groups to sign letters of intent with specific hours and rates to locate to the proposed facility. These letters of intent include larger regional institutions like Minnesota State University Mankato's tennis team and Bethany Lutheran College's tennis team. As a result, the Caswell Sports Regional Bonding Request not only assists local programs, but also guarantees partnership between the community and higher education institutions by co-locating uses in the same facilities. Therefore, it is a terrific example of partnership between the state and local entities.

Awarding the \$10.5 million dollars in state bonding appropriations responds to regional planning efforts, invests in a time proven existing statewide asset, addresses the demands of business leaders, resolves inequities in access to youth sporting facilities based on geography, and provides an asset that will be leveraged for decades for the prosperity of the region. It can also address an equity issue by considering the average household income in the Mankato/North Mankato area is lower than other areas of the state.

Project Timeline

Predesign – Completed

Engineering – Complete August 2020, pending bonding approval

Proposed Bid Date – August 2020

Construction Start – August/September 2020

Construction Complete – August/September 2021

Opening – October/November 2021

The only influencing factor is state bonding approval. All other financing is secured.

Other Considerations

Governor Walz asked the state of Minnesota to “write a new way” in his 2019 State of the State request. Included in his exhortation was the story of Will and Ross, two students who took advantage of opportunities given to them in their local community, focused on their love of sports and eating, and turned it into a granola bar product now located in over 600 stores. Contrasting Will and Ross’ experience, Governor Walz shared the constraints other Minnesota communities, like Floodwood, who are trying to provide the same opportunities that “Will and Ross” turned into a tax generating business. Governor Walz also talked about Mayors across Minnesota working hard to improve their communities and seeking to partner with the state of Minnesota to ensure the future prosperity of their communities.

The Caswell Regional Sporting Complex bonding request answers each and every call Governor Walz made to Minnesotans to “write a new way.” The request provides opportunities for youth and adults in the region, invests in a time proven state asset requiring enhancements to continue meeting the expectations of its visitors, and partners with an entire region seeking to secure its future prosperity by creating amenities that will attract workers and residents to Minnesota. The Caswell Regional Sporting Complex request is not simply a youth sporting facility, it is a critical piece to ensuring the Mankato/North Mankato MSA continues to prosper and eliminates barriers to that success linked to geography.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

City of North Mankato

Who will operate the facility?

City of North Mankato

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public, local youth athletic teams, area public schools, in-state visiting teams, out of state visiting teams, international visiting teams, Minnesota Attack Volleyball Club, Minnesota Rise AAU basketball, the Mankato Area Basketball Association, the Mankato Area Tennis Association, Minnesota State University Mankato Tennis Team, Bethany Lutheran College Tennis Team, Caswell Regional Sporting Complex staff, other local groups.

Public Purpose

See "other considerations" response. To promote the economic and social benefits of sports and

sports tourism.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

John Harrenstein
City Administrator
507-625-4143
johnharrenstein@northmankato.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$10.5 million in general obligation bonds for this project.

(\$ in thousands)

Caswell Park Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$136 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$405 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$14,740 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$165 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$1,054 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Regional Transit Hub | 1 | GO | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 |

Regional Transit Hub**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,500 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$2,500,000 in State funds is requests to acquire real property; prepare the site, including any environmental remediation; and predesign, design, construct, furnish, and equip a regional transit hub. |

Project Description

The regional transit hub will include (public bathrooms and waiting area, pavillion), access drive and parking lots to service this project. There will be six parking stalls on immediately adjacent to the transit station, with three of those handicapped accessible. There will be nine parking stalls along the access road. There would be estimated thirty-six parking stalls in the two proposed parking areas currently owned by the City. The total parking of all of these would be forty-two parking stalls related to the project. There are plans for a quiet zone safe crossing improvement with the project as well. We anticipate significant pedestrian and bicycle access as well due to the convenient central location in Northfield.

Project Rationale

Hiawathaland Transit, serving transit for Southeast Minnesota via Three Rivers Community Action, has been working with the City of Northfield and the Minnesota Department of Transportation to complete a transit hub station since the early 2000s. The transit station has been identified as a key priority in increasing ridership both in Northfield and connecting to neighboring communities including Lonsdale and Faribault. This is a regional transportation hub for major employment in this area. We are in discussions with Minnesota Valley Transit Authority (MVTA) for connections to a potential future commuter park and ride at Highway 19 and Interstate 35 that would connect to the southern metropolitan outer-ring suburbs.

The location is strategically located in the central part of the City of Northfield (a regional center) just off of Highway 3. Additionally, the area surrounding the location has been identified as a likely redevelopment area and this project is expected to assist in spurring new economic development for the community serving the larger region.

The transit station would also be utilized by Northfield Lines that has daily routes to the Twin Cities. They have indicated a commitment to using this transfer station.

The transit station is next to the Union Pacific Railroad and identified future Dan Patch Commuter Rail spur. Long term, this station could be used in conjunction with future passenger rail immediately adjacent to this area.

The City has already made major safety improvements by self-funding pedestrian crossing improvements in 2016 at their expense and MnDOT review and approval. The close proximity to major employment and destinations in downtown Northfield make this an ideal site for many

reasons. Additionally, the City of Northfield has completed construction plans and specifications for transit hub and access drive. The parking lots proposed would need design completing. Phased development would be anticipated to begin as early as 2020 dependent upon funding.

Project Timeline

Acquire Land 06/20
Predesign 08/20
Design 01/21
Construct, Furnish & Equip 12/21

Other Considerations

None.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Not applicable.

Who will own the facility?

City of Northfield

Who will operate the facility?

City of Northfield

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Hiawathaland Transit (Three Rivers Community Action)

Public Purpose

The public purpose is to utilize the project for a transit station owned by the City and operated by Hiawathaland Transit (Three Rivers Community Action). There would be public bus service available to the region and also pursuing other transit options such as Hiawathaland Transit, future potential MVTA connection and the privately run Northfield Lines. It also will serve local pedestrians and bicyclists including those utilizing the future Mill Towns State Trail that will connect through Northfield.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$25,000 MPCA Grant

Project Contact Person

Ben Martig
City Administrator
507-645-3009
ben.martig@ci.northfield.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Regional Transit Hub

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$601 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,101 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,101 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,101 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Norell Ave and State Frontage Road - Realignment | 1 | GO | 794 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 794 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 794 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Norell Ave and State Frontage Road - Realignment

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$794

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Due to high volumes of traffic, delays and high incidence of crashes with above average severity, the City of Oak Park Heights is requesting \$794,392 from the State to implement safety/traffic improvements to 60th Street (STH 36 Frontage Road) and Norell Ave. The proposal is to “pullback” from STH 36, 60th Street and which will improve maneuverability, safety and access. The Project includes a roundabout and all roads will be maintained by the City. The Project estimate is \$2.23 Million.

Project Description

Project Description:

The Project seeks to shift to the south STH 36 Frontage Road (60th Street) approximately 300' southwardly and install a roundabout as the main point of connection through Norell Ave. supplanting the current location which experiences significant issues and safety issues as it is too close to the mainline STH 36. The relocation will improve safety, facilitate easier turning movements, reduce congestion and allow for some additional stacking of vehicles as these move northbound to STH 36.

To undertake this Project, the City Engineer has provided a cost estimate of \$2,032,783. However some additional Right-of Way may be necessary adding an additional \$200,000 to such costs, bringing the total estimate to \$2,232,783.

It should be noted that the City already controls much of the necessary right-of-way, either in fee-ownership or in signed roadway easement. Walmart did provide to the City - for \$1.00 - a substantial and VITAL roadway easement for this Project, but should this Project not proceed - such easement will be lost.

To fund this necessary Project, the City has secured a grant of \$644,000 from the MNDOT- Municipal Agreement Program. This \$644,000 must be encumbered not later than 2021. The City of Oak Park Heights has also committed \$794,392 to the Project; leaving a unfunded GAP of \$794,392 and is the request herein.

TOTAL Project Cost: \$2,232,783

Request - State Bond 2020 \$ 794,392 (rounded)

City: \$ 794,392 (rounded)

MNDOT: \$ 644,000

With the final funding of \$794,392 , the City will be able to utilize the \$644,000 from MNDOT as well as the easements generously provided. All of which will improve safety and mobility for the greater

community and the Project will be undertaken promptly in 2021.

Project Rationale

The rationale to complete this Project is threefold:

1. To Address Safety:

Due to the number and severity of crashes, this intersection is in need of improvements.

The intersection of 60th Street N & Norell Avenue well exceeds the critical CRASH RATE and SEVERITY RATE for similar intersections.

The Crash Rate for this intersection is 1.76 compared to a .18 average for similar intersection. Being above .42 is considered "critical". In terms of Crash Severity, this intersection is at 2.53 compared to an average of .27. being above .50 is considered "critical".

The predominant crash types are - Right Angle (41.7%), Read End (33.3%), and Sideswipe Passing (16.7%). The high frequency of crashes at this intersection is attributed to the roadway design and the close proximity to the TH-36 & Norell Avenue N intersection. The Project is expected to significantly improve these conditions.

NOTE:

Crash Rate: Number of crashes per million vehicle miles traveled (for a roadway segment) or per million vehicles entering an intersection.

Severity Rate: Severity Rate is a linearly weighted ranking system for the crashes (i.e. K=5, A=4, B=3, etc.)(K=Fatality, A=Incapacitating Injury, B=Non-Incapacitating Injury)

2. To Address Congestion

As this intersection is a locus of significant delays for the community and which also relates to the safety concerns. Based on completed Traffic Studies, the Level of Service for the intersection at 60th Street and Norell Ave. is generally at a grade of "F" – or very poor and likely to worsen as traffic increases along STH 36. The intersection experiences tremendous delays and back-ups due to increasing volumes on all roads. The Project is expected to significantly improve these conditions.

3. To Maintain Access & Foster Economic Development.

This intersection serves a number of retailers that generate high-volumes of traffic - including Walmart, Menards, Kohls and Lowes as well as a number of other smaller retailers. Should traffic congestion continue to worsen, it is possible that these large and small retailers might view this location as no-longer viable for their business model. Further, there remains some vacant land in this vicinity that must plan on sending their potential customers through this area if development occurs. However if the intersction and areas are already at capacity and/or unsafe, investors in this property for new enterprises or redevelopment would likely be stymied.

Project Timeline

Depending on funding timelines, the City would expect to fully construct and complete the proposed Project in 2021. As follows is the PROPOSED PROJECT SCHEDULE – Assuming Funding is known in Spring 2020. NOTE: The City would need to comply with Any Bonding Requirements and MNDOT Municipal Agreement Requirements.

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Kickoff Meeting | May, 2020 |
| Design Surveys | May-June, 2020 |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Concept Layout | June, 2020 |
| 60% Plans to MnDOT | August, 2020 |
| 90% Plans to MnDOT | October, 2020 |
| Request Cooperative Agreement | October, 2020 |
| 100 % Plans to MnDOT | November, 2020 |
| MnDOT D6 Final Plan Review | December, 2020 |
| Stantec Final Plan Revisions | December, 2020 |
| Plan Signed by MnDOT | December, 2020 |
| Ad for Bid | January, 2021 |
| City Executes Cooperative Agreement | January, 2021 |
| Bid Letting | January, 2021 |
| Cooperative Agreement Fully Executed by MnDOT | March, 2021 |
| Project Award | March, 2021 |
| Commence Construction | May 2021 |
| Construction MID POINT | August 2021 |
| Substantial Completion and Road Open | October 2021 |

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NONE. However, the Project would become the responsibility of the City to operate and maintain in perpetuity and would reduce future State costs (direct and indirect).

Who will own the facility?

The City of Oak Park Heights will be assuming these areas and roads FROM the State of Minnesota, reducing the State's long-term maintenance obligations.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Oak Park Heights will operate the facility in perpetuity.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The "users" of this facility are from the regional area and NOT simply Oak Park Heights residents. Rather, this area serves as an economic / retail hub for eastern Washington County and eastern St. Croix County (WI).

Public Purpose

The public purpose of this Project is to enhance safety, reduce congestion and improve access.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Who will own the facility?

The City has received a "Municipal Agreement Grant" from MNDOT for \$644,000 and which is being applied to this Project. These funds expire in 2021.

Project Contact Person

Eric Johnson
City Administrator
651-439-4439
eajohnson@cityofoakparkheights.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Norell Ave and State Frontage Road - Realignment

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$794 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$644 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$794 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,232 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$256 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,626 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,232 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Graham Park Regional Multi-Use Expo Building | 1 | GO | 12,500 | 0 | 0 | 12,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed Interchange at County Road 104 and Trunk Highway 14 - Engineering and Right of Way Acquisition (Phase I) | 2 | GO | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Material Recovery Facility - Design Phase | 3 | GO | 300 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 16,300 | 0 | 0 | 12,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 16,300 | 0 | 0 | 12,500 | 0 | 0 |

Graham Park Regional Multi-Use Expo Building

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$12,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Graham Park has served the residents of southeast Minnesota as a community asset for 100 years, focusing on agriculture, community events, entertainment and youth athletics. A new multi-use arena/expo building at Graham Park is the cornerstone of redevelopment plans for the park, which are already being implemented. State bonding dollars will help ensure a key component of the renovation and an important regional asset exists to serve the region year-round for the next 100 years.

Project Description

Olmsted County’s vision for a new arena/expo building is to create a facility, approximately 80,000+ square feet, to meet resident and regional needs related to plant and animal agriculture, family and cultural events, sports and recreation. The Graham Park master plan envisions a park dedicated to all communities in southeast Minnesota. When complete, the park expects to expand its growing list of events such as weddings, horse and hog shows, swap meets, ethnic celebrations, hockey tournaments, concerts and other community gatherings. Specifically, the arena/expo building is intended to be a flexible, multipurpose indoor space consisting of two separate flat floor spaces that can be joined to form a single large arena when desired.

The County has already begun implementing its Graham Park master plan. In 2019 and 2020, roughly \$5 million will be spent on deferred maintenance and upgrades to the Graham Arena complex. In addition, the County has purchased 11 acres of immediately adjacent land which provides an excellent opportunity for the community. Development there will enhance the park and help meet significant regional needs like housing – especially workforce and/or student housing – or transportation solutions.

To support animal-focused events, the arena/expo building would be paired with a corral. Trucks with trailers – abundant during the Olmsted County FREE Fair and at many other times – could circulate around the corral to unload animals right into the arena through a dedicated entrance. A staging area with truck and trailer parking would be located west of the corral.

A new restaurant is proposed on the eastern edge of the arena/expo building, conveniently situated to serve Graham Park visitors and the general public. The restaurant is especially needed for those at the four Graham Arenas, which host roughly 750,000 visitors every year. During sporting tournament weekends, access to food and eateries has been a frequent complaint. With teams coming from as far away as Alaska, Kansas and Canada, providing high-quality food and beverages in close proximity to the Graham Arena complex is a significant potential revenue stream for the park. The plan is for the restaurant to have outdoor dining space, which will liven up the streetscape along a newly renovated Fairgrounds Avenue. This shared use street would be plaza-like, with restricted vehicular circulation during events. Landscape screening, public art, mural work, and/or decorative lighting would all improve the space, making it a desirable destination for those beyond arena event attendees.

A new parking lot along 16th Street would serve visitors to the new arena/expo space and restaurant as well as the Graham Arenas.

Project Rationale

Dr. Christopher Graham donated the Graham Park parcel to Olmsted County in 1919, with a charter to provide a regional asset for educational and agricultural opportunities. Over the decades, the park has been ignored. In recent years a market study made clear the region needed updated facilities to host plant and animal agriculture events. But space is also needed for recreational events like cultural and religious events, trade shows, concerts, gun shows and exhibits.

This project is not just visionary, but transformative. It will take a tired, worn-out and barely used parcel of land and turn it into an exciting gathering spot for an entire region. And it is clearly needed and wanted. The residents of Olmsted County recently completed a survey which indicated 61% of respondents rated an expo building as very important or essential to Graham Park which reinforced our Master Plan.

Project Timeline

Conceptual plans have been completed, but formal design for construction documents will start after approval of bonding support. We anticipate the construction schedule to be two years from formal design commencement to occupancy.

Other Considerations

Graham Park is currently an underutilized asset and has the potential to transform into a self-supporting enterprise offering facilities available year-round for a wide variety of activities. To achieve this vision, Olmsted County adopted a Master Plan for Graham Park redevelopments and has already invested \$6.5 million with a planned total investment of \$56 million to implement the four phases of the plan. This bonding request seeks funding for half of phase two of the plan, which is the design and construction of a new multi-use arena/expo building.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Olmsted County

Who will operate the facility?

Olmsted County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Olmsted County will occupy the facility which will be made available to the public for multiple events and uses.

Public Purpose

Graham Park has a solid foundation from which it can expand and grow into a self-supporting enterprise offering facilities available year-round that can accommodate a wide variety of community events, ethnic, cultural celebrations and festivals and entertainment and leisure activities. The number of events of all kinds have been steadily increasing over the past few years. We expect the need for space to increase as the recently renovated Mayo Civic Center comes under new management with a mission to increase revenues from local and national conferences.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This project has not received any previous state appropriations and this request is the only planned bonding request for redevelopments at Graham Park.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer Berquam
Legislative Analyst
507-328-6006
berquam.jennifer@co.olmsted.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$12.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Graham Park Regional Multi-Use Expo Building

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$12,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$12,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$22,450 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Proposed Interchange at County Road 104 and Trunk Highway 14 - Engineering and Right of Way Acquisition (Phase I)

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$3,500

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: Olmsted County seeks state capital investment for engineering services and to acquire right of way for a proposed interchange at County Road (CR) 104 and Trunk Highway (TH) 14 located between Rochester and Byron. Overall objectives of the project are to improve safety and support regional growth and economic development. The County requests \$3,500,000 state bonding dollars for the state share of the project, to be matched with \$1,500,000 county funds for the county share of the project.

Project Description

The proposed project consists of a new interchange at CR 104 and TH 14, and an associated fly-over structure at 7th Street NW, thereby eliminating two at-grade intersections. Phase I of the project includes engineering services and right of way acquisition. Engineering services will include environmental documentation, a geometric layout, and preliminary design. Right of way acquisition will be necessary to accommodate the proposed improvements. The cost of Phase I is \$5 million. Initial review of the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) Cost Participation Policy indicates a cost sharing of 70% MnDOT and 30% local. Olmsted County is not seeking funding for Phase II of the project at this time, which consists of construction of the new interchange and associated fly-over.

Project Rationale

Just west of Rochester, CR 104 intersects TH 14 at a skewed angle. Due to the angle and the significant number of vehicles passing through the intersection, there are a number of significant safety concerns for drivers. TH 14 carries 30,000 vehicles per day traveling at 65 MPH and CR 104 has 3,000 vehicles per day at this location. Based on these traffic volumes, the MnDOT Access Management Manual indicates high risk conditions for vehicles on CR 104 trying to find an adequate gap in traffic flows on TH 14. Crashes at the intersection average 10-13 per year. The proposed interchange at CR 104 and the 7th Street NW fly-over structure will remove two at-grade intersections, which eliminates 64 conflict points.

TH 14 is also a regional corridor serving as a primary commuter route from the west into Rochester. A new interchange at CR 104/TH 14 will not only address safety concerns, but also improve the regional corridor for commuters into Rochester, improve a regional freight route, and support future economic growth and development for the region.

Project Timeline

With funding, engineering work and right of way acquisition is expected to begin on July 1, 2021. Phase I work is anticipated to conclude after 18 months.

Other Considerations

The proposed interchange at CR 104 and TH 14 is identified as a need in the Long-Range Transportation Plan of the Rochester-Olmsted Council of Governments. A 2009 Corridor Study, a federal environmental report, and an adopted official map have been completed. The project is supported by Cascade Township and the Rochester Area Chamber of Commerce. The City of Rochester supports the project and is interested in exploring a park and ride at this location.

The project type listed below is "multiple" because the overall project includes roadway, bridges, rail, etc.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None known

Who will own the facility?

Olmsted County and MnDOT

Who will operate the facility?

Olmsted County and MnDOT

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Traveling public

Public Purpose

Infrastructure

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous state appropriations associated with this project.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer Berquam
Legislative Analyst
651-308-8266
berquam.jennifer@co.olmsted.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Proposed Interchange at County Road 104 and Trunk Highway 14 - Engineering and Right of Way Acquisition (Phase I)

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Material Recovery Facility - Design Phase

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$300

Priority Ranking: 3

Project Summary: Olmsted County seeks state capital investment to build a material recovery facility (MRF) co-located with the Olmsted County Waste to Energy Facility (OWEF). Objectives of the MRF are to remove recoverable and noncombustible materials from the waste stream to be further processed and to increase capacity and efficiency of the OWEF. Olmsted County seeks \$300,000 state capital investment for 50 percent of the costs associated with the design phase of the MRF project.

Project Description

Construction and development of the material recovery facility (MRF) will consist of a design phase and two separate construction phases. Descriptions of the three phases are as follows:

Design Phase: This phase will include working with a consultant to design the two construction phases of the project. The design phase will focus on determination of specific technology for the products and commodities that are to be processed, system and building throughput, outbound material, maintenance, safety and site considerations.

Phase I Construction: Phase I will focus on the installation of recycling and separation components to clean municipal solid waste (MSW). The objective of this phase is to remove materials that do not combust and may cause damage to the waste-to-energy system, and then sell those collected materials (metals, glass and other non-combustibles) to end markets.

Phase II Construction: Phase II will involve the implementation of co-mingled recycling material separation components. The objective of this phase is to improve recycling rates and increase the quality and value of recovered products such as plastics, paper, cardboard and separated food scraps.

Project Rationale

Olmsted County intends to construct and operate a material recovery facility (MRF) to reclaim materials and remove problematic items from the waste stream. Olmsted County is seeking partners to improve SE Minnesota's overall recycling system efficiencies by leveraging new and existing synergies within the region's network of interrelated solid waste management systems. A regional MRF adjoining the Olmsted Waste-to-Energy Facility (OWEF) will provide another option for local businesses and governments in meeting their solid waste and sustainability goals by enhancing economic vitality while conserving natural resources and energy. A SE Minnesota regional facility will benefit stakeholders by:

- Providing a safe, environmentally focused and cost-effective material recovery system;
- Allowing local businesses convenient access to a SE Minnesota MRF to enhance their solid waste programming;

- Increasing local recycling rates;
- Allowing waste material to move further up the waste hierarchy by removing recoverable materials from the waste stream;
- Developing a solid waste system that enhances managing materials for lowest-impact to the environment;
- Meeting local solid waste objectives and gaining efficiencies through economies of scale; and
- Sharing responsibility, costs and potential revenue for environmentally sound management of recoverable materials.

This facility is needed for the region because it will:

- Provide SE Minnesota counties and businesses a local option for recyclable material processing through a modern MRF;
- Support counties' waste diversion goals;
- Meet requirements of the US recycling industry to clean and sort material;
- Prepare quality recyclable materials that are marketable for end-use manufacturers;
- Reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions by eliminating long transport of mixed recyclables to other areas for processing;
- Maximize capacity at area resource recovery facilities.

Recycling is an essential component of waste management in Olmsted County. Recycling (along with reduction, reuse and composting) is at the top of the state's waste management hierarchy and plays a critical role as a waste abatement strategy to minimize solid waste disposal at waste-to-energy and landfill facilities. Minnesota Statute § 115A.551 requires counties to develop and implement recycling programs to reach state recycling goals and submit program strategies to the MPCA for approval. Olmsted County is committed to improving recycling outcomes in the area by strengthening partnerships with other local units of government, businesses, nonprofits, the waste and recycling industry. Olmsted County will work with partners to improve local recycling opportunities by using new and existing technology. The MRF would promote innovation and collaboration as well as being responsive to the changing recycling industry. This project will help achieve state recycling goals, will meet many of the County's long-range goals, and will provide better waste management options for residents.

Project Timeline

The design phase of the MRF project is anticipated to convene in July 2020 and conclude in July 2021. Phase I is anticipated to convene in the second half of 2021 and conclude in 2022. Phase II is anticipated to convene in the second half of 2022 and conclude in 2023. This bonding request seeks funding only for the design phase.

Other Considerations

The proposed MRF will be designed to serve the entire southeast region of the state. Dodge County and local private businesses have already indicated interest in partnering with Olmsted County on the MRF project and other counties and regional partners will be invited to participate as well.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None known

Who will own the facility?

Olmsted County

Who will operate the facility?

Olmsted County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Olmsted County, neighboring counties, private haulers, private businesses, and other regional partners.

Public Purpose

Minnesota Statute § 115A.551 requires counties to develop and implement recycling programs to reach state recycling goals and submit program strategies to the MPCA for approval. Olmsted County is committed to improving recycling outcomes in the area by strengthening partnerships with other local units of government, businesses, nonprofits, and the waste and recycling industry. The MRF would promote innovation and collaboration as well as being responsive to the changing recycling industry. This project will help achieve state recycling and the County's long-range solid waste goals, while providing a more effective and efficient waste management system for the residents of SE Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No state appropriations have been provided to Olmsted County for a material recovery facility.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer Berquam
Legislative Analyst
651-308-8266
berquam.jennifer@co.olmsted.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Material Recovery Facility - Design Phase

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Oronoco Wastewater System | 1 | GO | 20,384 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 20,384 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 20,384 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Oronoco Wastewater System

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$20,384

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$20.4 million in State Bonding funds is requested to complete property acquisition, finalize bidding documents and to construct a wastewater collection and treatment sewer system in conjunction with water main distribution improvements to serve the City of Oronoco and Oronoco Estates Mobile Home Community.

Project Description

Oronoco’s proposed wastewater & water distribution system improvements are comprised of a wastewater treatment facility (WWTF), sanitary sewer collection and conveyance infrastructure and associated water main distribution improvements. The Facility Plan including figures and costs estimates has been uploaded into the CBS system for the reader’s reference.

Oronoco is the largest unsewered city in Minnesota and has a water supply and distribution system that currently serves about 2/3 of the community. The City has been working hard to address residents failing subsurface treatment systems, protect the City’s groundwater supply and protect surface waters (Middle Fork Zumbro River) flowing through the City. To address these concerns, the City prepared a Regional Wastewater Study in 2018 and subsequently, a Wastewater / Water Facility Plan that is currently under review by the MPCA. The Wastewater Facility Plan includes a phased approach to serve all of the developed areas of Oronoco with sewer by approximately 2030.

Wastewater Treatment:

The proposed wastewater system includes a 0.491 million gallon per day (MGD) Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) that is being designed to serve the City of Oronoco, Oronoco Estates Mobile Home Community and could be expanded in the future to serve Rochester NW Territories and other areas if desired. The proposed WWTF would be located approximately ½ mile north of 85th Street NW and ¼ mile east of TH 52 and would be a mechanical plant using a Sequencing Batch Reactor (SBR) treatment process. The WWTF would discharge a high-quality effluent to the north, into the Middle Fork of the Zumbro River.

Wastewater Collection and Conveyance:

Oronoco’s rolling topography, diverse geology and river systems, in combination with the existing Trunk Highway 52 facilities and growing residential development make the planning and implementation of an efficient sanitary sewer collection and conveyance system a significant challenge. Wastewater from Oronoco would be collected using a combination of gravity sanitary sewer and small diameter force mains with grinder stations. The proposed lateral sanitary sewer will convey collected wastewater to a system of four lift stations that ultimately aggregate wastewater flows and pump it to the proposed WWTF for treatment.

Wastewater Project Phasing:

Wastewater service will be provided in phases and will eventually serve all Oronoco existing and future development. The WWTF is designed to provide treatment capacity over the next ~20 years and the sanitary sewer collection system construction includes two phases. Phase 1 is further subdivided into Phase 1A, 1B and 1C. Phase 1A is proposed for construction beginning in 2020 and would serve the areas of greatest need and areas with existing community wastewater collection and treatment systems (Oronoco Sewer Districts B, C, F, G, J, K & Z and Oronoco Estates Mobile Home Community). Phase 1B is a future phase of construction that would serve developed areas with less urgent needs and would be completed over the next ten years and includes Sewer Districts A, D, E, H, L, M and the Cravath Subdivision. Phase 1C is also future construction and includes all new development and redevelopment projected to occur over the next 20 years. Phase 1C wastewater collection and conveyance would be funded by future development. Phase 2 improvements would serve future development beyond ~2043 and may include WWTF expansion.

Water Distribution Improvements:

The proposed area A, C, F and Z water main distribution improvements are to be constructed in conjunction with the initial Phase 1A of Oronoco's wastewater collection and treatment improvements beginning in 2020. The proposed water distribution improvements would serve all areas of Oronoco that are planned to be served with Phase 1A sanitary sewer but, are not currently served by Oronoco's water distribution system. The water distribution and sanitary sewer improvements within Areas A, C, F and Z are expected to frequently encounter bedrock and we anticipate joint trench construction would be implemented to reduce construction costs. Moreover, the construction of sanitary sewers within these areas will impact / disturb many surface features (roads, private utilities, driveways, drainage features, etc.) and it makes sense to construct both water distribution and sanitary sewer improvements as part of the same project to minimize restoration costs and disturbance to area residents and businesses.

The proposed water distribution system improvements in Areas A, C, F and Z generally include construction of trunk and lateral watermains, water services for adjacent parcels, fire hydrants, valves and associated appurtenances. The proposed water distribution improvements will provide water service and fire protection for adjacent parcels and will also strengthen the overall water distribution system by looping water main and improve system reliability, improving fire flows and reducing stagnation concerns.

Project Costs and Funding:

The total estimated project costs for Oronoco's Wastewater System and Water Distribution Improvements totals \$37,980,000 and would be constructed in 2020, 2021 and 2022. Existing agency wastewater infrastructure funding programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority (PFA) and USDA Rural Development (RD) are structured to finance the rehabilitation of existing wastewater infrastructure or construct SSTs for small communities with minimal growth potential. Unfortunately, Oronoco does not fit into this mold. Oronoco is starting from the beginning and does not have the existing municipal wastewater system needed to serve its growing population. Oronoco can and has qualified for a low interest loan through PFA's Clean Water & Drinking Water Revolving Funds which could be used to fund the proposed water / wastewater improvements but cannot afford to make the payments on a project of this size and scope.

The proposed wastewater system would serve Oronoco Estates Mobile Home Community, which is located in Oronoco Township and is on the South boundary of Oronoco's ultimate service boundary. Oronoco Estates includes 216 sites and anticipates adding an additional 100 sites (316 total) and currently served by a private well and wastewater stabilization ponds with spray irrigation discharge. Oronoco Estates offers affordable housing and more than half of their residents are seniors. That

average annual income of mobile homeowners is approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000. The opportunity to provide reliable and affordable wastewater service to Oronoco Estates is an important part of providing low income and affordable housing in SE Minnesota.

The City of Oronoco's overall median income is too high to qualify for significant grant funding. However, the older areas of Oronoco (Sewer District B, C & F) were surveyed in 2008 and at that time, the reported median income was \$42,500. This is also the area with the greatest need for a wastewater system service.

The only way Oronoco can afford a wastewater system is through a combination of Minnesota Bonding funds, PSIG / PFA administered grant and loans and local cost share. Local cost share would be comprised of assessments / connection charges, user fees and local tax revenue. The following text summarizes the project cost share by element:

Total estimated project costs (Wastewater Collection and Treatment - \$35,220,000) + (Water Distribution Improvements - \$2,760,000) yields a combined total project cost of \$37,980,000. Oronoco's anticipated local share for these improvements, paid through assessments, connection charges / fees would be \$7,596,000 or 20% of the project costs. The 20% local share does not include the costs to complete individual sewer and water connections between the property line to each home or abandonment of existing wells and subsurface treatment systems. The cost to complete construction and abandonment on private property will vary and is estimated to be approximately \$7,500 to \$15,000 per parcel receiving both sewer and water service. It should also be noted that Oronoco anticipates that the project will qualify for approximately \$7,000,000 in grant funding through PFA Wastewater / PSIG (Point Source Implementation Grant). However, these grant funds are not guaranteed and if Oronoco does not qualify for the anticipated grant funds, the City would need to request additional funding from the State.

How Oronoco is Different from Other Communities:

Oronoco is not like many of the other communities that have problems funding upgrades, expansions or maintenance to existing wastewater infrastructure.

1. Oronoco has no existing wastewater treatment and minimal sewer collection infrastructure. Nearly all of the infrastructure needed to serve Oronoco would be constructed with new materials and utilize the latest technology.
2. Many communities throughout the state struggle with inflow and infiltration problems resulting in hydraulic loading and capacity issues because they have old clay pipe and brick manhole sewer collection systems that are far from watertight and need to be upgraded. Oronoco has the advantage that all of its collection system would be new construction, with PVC pipe and reinforced concrete manholes. This advantage should mitigate the hydraulic loading challenges that many cities struggle with.
3. Oronoco's WWTF will be constructed with the latest materials and technology and with completely new equipment and structures. Trying to upgrade or rehab existing infrastructure that is 50+ years old is both difficult and expensive.
4. Oronoco has significant growth potential due to its proximity to the City of Rochester, the Mayo Clinic Destination Medical Center initiative, its location on TH 52 and a significant amount of land located in its urban service district. Over the next 20 years, Oronoco's population is expected to double to just under 3,000 people and Oronoco's Ultimate Service Area will eventually serve 9,670 Equivalent Residential Units.

Project Rationale

Currently, the City of Oronoco is the largest un-sewered community in the State of Minnesota.

Oronoco's 2018 population is currently ~1,500 and is located ~5 miles north of Rochester on TH 52. The rationale of the project is summarized in the following paragraphs:

Failing Subsurface Treatment Systems:

In 2013, the City completed a Community Assessment Report (CAR) that evaluated the private wastewater treatment systems in downtown Oronoco, north of the Zumbro River. This report determined that more than 75% of the systems in the study area are either not compliant with current Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) standards, or were at the end of their expected service life. Moreover, of the 111 parcels evaluated, 26% were classified as an Imminent Threat to Public Health and Safety and 35% were classified as Failing to Protect Groundwater! We believe that all of the older SSTS in Oronoco are in similar condition to the CAR study area.

The majority of the properties with non-compliant Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) do not have cost effective options to replace their existing systems due to the presence of bedrock, high groundwater, soil conditions, proximity to the floodplain, size of their lot and setback requirements. Moreover, residents with non-compliant systems cannot easily sell their properties as financial institutions are reluctant to finance mortgages for properties without compliant SSTS.

MPCA Imposed Deadline Approaching:

In 2015, the MPCA, Olmsted County and the City of Oronoco executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will expire in 2020. Under the terms of the MOU, non-compliant SSTS in the older parts of Oronoco will be exempt from new County / MPCA requirements and associated enforcement action but, must be brought in to compliance or connected to a municipal wastewater system by 2020. Failure to meet this requirement would be a significant setback for the City and a hardship for its residents. The following paragraphs discuss the SSTS Ordinance and MOU requirements in greater detail.

Olmsted County recently updated their Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) Ordinance in an effort to comply with recent revisions to state regulations, Chapters 7080 to 7083. The new state and county SSTS regulation are a great source of concern to the City of Oronoco and its residents. If existing, non-compliant SSTS are required to comply with the SSTS Ordinance requirements in order to sell or upgrade their properties, the investment in these SSTS will undermine support for the proposed municipal wastewater collection and treatment system. This would result in prolonging our struggle to serve Oronoco residents with wastewater collection and treatment at a cost that would be significantly greater than what is currently proposed.

In recognition of this concern, the MPCA, Olmsted County and the City of Oronoco executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to address the aforementioned concerns. The MOU states that the properties located within Sewer District B, C or F will have a separate set of standards for SSTS for the five-year period starting on the effective date of the MOU. The standards are based on the understanding that this area will ultimately be served by a municipal wastewater collection and treatment system. The MOU applies to SSTS that are failing to protect groundwater or pose an imminent threat to public health and safety (ITPH). ITPH is discharge of wastewater to the surface or building and failure to protect groundwater is a system that is not compliant with MR 7080.1500. Subp. 4.B (SSTS without the minimum vertical separation requirement, pit, not properly abandoned).

Need to Protect Drinking and Surface Waters:

Oronoco is located in an "Active Karst" geologic area which is underlain by carbonate bedrock with less than 50 feet of sediment cover. Oronoco's karst geology, in combination with its proximity to the Zumbro River make protecting both ground and surface waters a priority. The elimination of hundreds

of noncompliant SSTS systems in Oronoco would be a significant step toward protecting both resources. Moreover, the Minnesota Geologic Survey (MGS) measures the sensitivity of the groundwater system to pollution throughout Minnesota. The City of Oronoco is in an area where groundwater sensitivity to pollution is high to very high (MGS, 1988). High sensitivity means that contaminants will likely reach the water table in weeks to years and that little natural protection exists to slow vertical movement of liquids through the soil; very high sensitivity means that contaminants will almost certainly reach the water table in hours to months. These sensitivity ratings further reinforce the urgency to eliminate existing SSTS systems and construct a municipal wastewater collection and treatment system for the City of Oronoco. To that end, the Olmsted County Water Management Plan (2013-2023) supports the development of a Municipal Wastewater System in Oronoco.

Support Smart Growth:

Oronoco is poised for significant growth if a municipal wastewater system can be constructed. Facts that support this assertion are summarized as follows:

- Located ~ 5 miles north of Rochester on TH 52.
- The Mayo Clinic's DMC initiative is underway and beginning to create demand for housing and spurring commercial and economic growth within the region.
- Recently constructed TH 52 infrastructure including interchanges, an overpass and frontage road provide safe, efficient, and effective access to Oronoco.
- Oronoco is located at the confluence of the Middle Fork and South Branch of the Zumbro River. Nestled in the bluffs of the Zumbro River Valley, Oronoco has an abundance of natural beauty and outdoor recreational opportunities for prospective residents.
- The undeveloped land between Oronoco's southern Ultimate Service Area boundary and existing development will support a combination of residential and commercial development totaling ~9,670 Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs).
- There is a need to support growth, a mix of higher and lower density residential growth in combination with commercial development. Without a municipal wastewater system, implementation of smart growth principles will not be possible.

Project Timeline

The project is currently in the design, permitting and property acquisition phase of development which is being funded through a 2018 State Bonding Bill appropriation and City of Oronoco funds. Design permitting, property acquisition and preparation of bidding documents is planned to be completed by approximately August 2020. If sufficient State Bonding appropriations can be secured through the 2020 Bonding Bill, we anticipate construction could begin in October 2020 and would continue through October 2022 when the wastewater system would begin operations.

Other Considerations

The following facts further reinforce Oronoco's need for the proposed wastewater system and the necessity of State Bonding funding assistance to move the project forward.

1. Oronoco's 2014 LGA payment was \$70,114 and the 2018 LGA payment was \$77,920. The Average 2014 LGA funding for Cities with populations within ~ 200 population of Oronoco (pop. 1406) was \$395,510.84. This is 82.3% less LGA funding than other, similarly sized Minnesota Cities. If Oronoco received an additional \$325,396.84 in LGA to match the average LGA payment for similarly sized Cities, this funding would make a principal and interest payment on a 20-year PFA loan at 1% interest with a loan amount totaling \$7,226,306.
2. Over the course of the past six years, MnDOT and Olmsted County have "Turned Back" 5 bridges and 6.52 miles of roadway to the City of Oronoco to operate and maintain. Oronoco had no

authority to reject the turn backs under state law. The estimated cost to operate and maintain these facilities over the next 25 years totals nearly \$2.1 million or \$95,888 per year. The estimate is based on 2015 construction costs and excludes inflation. The 6.52 miles of turnback roadway increased Oronoco's total length of two-lane roadway by 30.7% to 21.25 miles. See attachments to Oronoco CBS for additional documentation on this topic.

3. Oronoco has a modest commercial / industrial tax base. The lack of a wastewater system inhibits Oronoco's ability to attract commercial / industrial development. Oronoco's 2019 tax levy was a modest \$843,875 and is in bottom 5% of Cities for LGA funding.

4. Oronoco is burdened with existing debit service to pay for the first phase of an ~ \$2.8M City water supply and distribution system constructed in 2009 & 2010. In addition, Phase 1B of the wastewater collection system improvements are tentatively planned for construction in 2030 and have a present value construction cost of \$5,630,000. The City of Oronoco and the benefiting property owners will likely need to fund these improvements in the future.

5. The proposed Oronoco wastewater system would serve Oronoco Estates Mobile Home Community which includes 216 sites and anticipates adding an additional 100 sites (total of 316 units) and is currently served by a private well and wastewater stabilization ponds with spray irrigation discharge. Oronoco Estates offers affordable housing and more than half of their residents are seniors. That average annual income of mobile homeowners is approximately \$20,000 to \$25,000. The opportunity to provide reliable and affordable wastewater service to Oronoco Estates is an important part of providing low income and affordable housing in SE Minnesota.

6. The proposed Wastewater System would serve Oronoco Phase 1 and Oronoco Estates in the short term. The potential also exists that the proposed WWTF could serve Rochester NW Territories when it develops in the future and possibly Sewer Districts A and E in Pine Island. Moreover, the proposed Regional WWTF would be well positioned to treat wastewater from the Village of Douglas and leachate from the nearby MPCA closed landfill. Douglas is located ~3 miles upstream of the proposed WWTF location and is believed to have issues with failing SSTS. The MPCA closed landfill is located 0.7 miles east of the proposed WWTF and currently trucks leachate to Rochester's WWTP for daily treatment. The annual cost for the MPCA to truck leachate to the City of Rochester WWTP is \$100,000 to \$150,000 per year. The leachate could potentially be pumped to the proposed WWTF via a grinder pump and small diameter forcemain for a much lower cost.

7. The cost to complete construction of private sewer and water services (from the road right-of-way to each home) and abandonment of existing private wells and septic tanks will vary and is estimated to be approximately \$7,500 to \$15,000 per parcel receiving both sewer and water service. This is a significant cost that is not eligible for public funding but, is a real cost that property owners will be required to finance and bear.

8. Oronoco has been planning for and investing in a future municipal wastewater system for some time. Oronoco's Interim Residential Subdivision Ordinance was developed and implemented in ~2002. Development under this Ordinance (and subsequent revisions) require that developers construct a municipal-type wastewater collection and potable water distribution system. Wastewater treatment for each subdivision was then provided by a Community Waste Treatment System (CWTS) and potable water was supplied by a community well and water distribution system. Both systems were intended to ultimately be incorporated into a traditional municipal water supply and sewer collection and treatment systems with the CWTS's being decommissioned in place and redeveloped as parkland or residential housing.

9. The construction of the municipal wastewater collection systems for development under the Interim Residential Subdivision Ordinance required a significant investment by the City of Oronoco and its residents. The result of this investment is that cost to serve these subdivisions is significantly less than the cost would be if the wastewater collection systems had not been constructed.

10. Serving Oronoco with a municipal wastewater system is complicated by some existing topographic, geologic and transportation infrastructure constraints. These challenges and constraints

are summarized as follows:

- Terrain is rolling with small bluffs, high bedrock and karst geology.
- U.S. Highway 52 bisects Oronoco in a north-south direction.
- The Middle Fork and South Branch of the Zumbro River generally flow west to east and merge in the center of Oronoco.
- Present-day Oronoco includes the original historic downtown area containing primarily smaller residential lots, residential lots developed along the former Lake Shady lakebed and more recent residential development consisting of larger lots, many of which were developed under Oronoco's Interim Residential Subdivision Ordinance.

11. Currently there are three commercial developments (~13 lots) and four residential developments (~255 Lots) that have been developed under this ordinance. The water supply and distribution systems have been incorporated into the City's water system. The abandonment of the existing CWTS's and conveyance of the associated wastewater can be completed efficiently and will also facilitate serving future development. In addition, serving these parcels is advantageous as it brings a significant number of users to the proposed wastewater utility to help pay for the infrastructure improvements and operation and maintenance costs.

12. A summary of investments associated with the development of a municipal Wastewater system over the past 15 years are include:

- \$65,000 for the preparation of the 2014 Facility Plan Cost.
- \$35,000 for Sewer and Water Committee Meetings – Engineering Services (2010 to 2016).
- \$20,000 for construction of TH 52 casings and small diameter force main pipe.
- \$2,000,000 for construction of Wastewater collection system serving ~ 255 Residential and Commercial Lots developed under the Interim Subdivision Ordinance.

The total cost of these recent investments in wastewater infrastructure total \$2,120,000 or 6.0% of the \$35,220,000 Wastewater system estimated project costs. This cost share does not show up in the CBS system calculations but, are an important consideration.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

The City of Oronoco

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Oronoco

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Oronoco

Public Purpose

Oronoco's proposed wastewater system and water distribution improvements will serve current and future residents and business owners with an effective means of collecting, treating and discharging wastewater in a manner that meets or exceeds MPCA and EPA requirements, while protecting public health along with ground and surface water resources from wastewater contamination.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City of Oronoco received a \$500,000 Capital Improvement Appropriation as part of the 2017 Legislature Bonding Bill. The funding was used to prepare a Regional Wastewater Study that included Oronoco, Oronoco Estates Mobile Home Community, Pine Island, and Rochester NW Territories. The Regional Wastewater Study was developed in September 2017 through August 2018. The Regional Wastewater Study facilitated dialog between the four communities, provided technical information, cost estimates and developed numerous options for varying levels of regional wastewater conveyance and treatment. Following completion of the Regional Wastewater Study, the remaining funds have been used to prepare a draft Facility Plan, draft Antidegradation Alternatives analysis, agency and public communications, permit and environmental document development, future land use planning and explore phosphorous trading options. The cost of the Regional Study was not included in the CBS past year state appropriations as it involved analysis of a regional solution.

The City of Oronoco received a \$2,500,000 Capital Improvement Appropriation as part of the 2018 Legislature Bonding Bill. The funding is currently being used to complete the Facility Plan, Antidegradation Alternatives Analysis, agency and public communications, permit and environmental document preparation, future land use planning, phosphorous trading agreement, acquisitions of property and easement for the WWTF and sewer collection system and pre-design, preliminary and final design of the proposed wastewater system.

Project Contact Person

Sandy Jessen
City Clerk / Treasurer
507-367-4405
oronococity@gmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Oronoco Wastewater System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$2,500 | \$20,384 | \$0 | \$0 |
| General Fund Cash | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$7,596 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$3,000 | \$34,980 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$15 | \$265 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$732 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$2,193 | \$2,805 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$60 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$31,625 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$35 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$3,000 | \$34,980 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail | 1 | GO | 1,978 | 0 | 0 | 1,978 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,978 | 0 | 0 | 1,978 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,978 | 0 | 0 | 1,978 | 0 | 0 |

Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,978

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: This 27-mile, 10-foot wide, multi-use paved trail would connect Perham and Pelican Rapids, and (very importantly) run through Maplewood State Park enroute. Would use public rights of way, which has rolling topography and numerous lakes and wetlands.
The trail was divided into four segments for constructability and funding purposes. This request is for construction of the McDonald segment of the trail and design of the segment of the trail that runs through Maplewood State Park.

Project Description

This project involves the construction of the McDonald Segment of the Pelican Rapids to Perham Regional Trail. The Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail is a 10-foot wide, 32-mile long, multi-use recreational trail connecting the communities of Perham and Pelican Rapids via Maplewood State Park. The trail is comprised of four segments: West (6.83 miles), Silent Lake (8.11 miles), McDonald (5.83 miles), and East (6.41 miles). The route has 25 named lakes on or nearby, in addition to wetlands. Otter Tail County, the Cities of Perham and Pelican Rapids, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, the West Central Initiative and the PartnerSHIP4Health worked together to develop the Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail Master Plan which as approved in 2014 (<http://ottertailcountymn.us/project/perham-to-pelican-rapids-trail>). The master planning process evoked rousing support for the trail among residents and businesses, and unanimous support from the Otter Tail County Board of Commissioners and both City Councils. This proposed trail was designated as "Regionally Significant" by the Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Commission on August 5, 2015.

Project Rationale

Otter Tail County has more lakes than any county in the United States, with over 1,000 lakes, and 25 named lakes on or within a mile of this route. Despite this, the County has limited access to state trails and has not experienced the economic benefits of outdoor recreation and trails the way other MN regions have. The Pelican Rapids to Perham Trail serves several important functions:

1. Economic Development

The economic benefits of trail development are well documented. Trails attract local and non-local visitors who stimulate the local economy, contribute to local and state taxes and create jobs. One of the most important ways that trails promote economic growth is through tourism. However, trails are also vital for attracting new business and talented workers and help keep established businesses competitive. Young families have cited trails as a key reason for relocating to rural Minnesota.

2. Expand Outdoor Recreational Opportunities

This proposal specifically aims to expand outdoor recreational opportunities by connecting the

communities of Pelican Rapids, Perham and surrounding areas to Maplewood State Park via a recreational trail. It will also expand existing state trail systems by connecting the Central Lakes and Heartland Trails in the future. Otter Tail County is in a beautiful part of Minnesota with an abundance of lakes, wetlands, rolling hills and agricultural areas. Outdoor recreation is an important part of the quality of life and the tourism economy in Otter Tail County

3. Transportation Alternatives

This project will provide important transportation alternatives for residents in and around Perham and Pelican Rapids, both of which have vigorous job centers. This trail will provide an opportunity for employees, their families and other rural residents to commute by means other than motorized vehicles. The trail will expand the opportunities for residents and visitors to enjoy active commuting and recreation as well as maintain a healthy and active lifestyle. Most significantly, the trail will provide a safe corridor for walking and biking and improved multi-modal access for residents and the other 150,000+ annual visitors to Maplewood State Park.

Project Timeline

The current timeline will allow construction on the McDonald segment and design of the Maplewood State Park segment to begin as soon as funding is available in summer 2020. Otter Tail County views this project as essential to the vitality of the region which is evidenced by the hiring an engineering consulting firm with County funds to complete required environmental documentation, prepare final plans and specifications and acquire any necessary easements so construction of the McDonald segment can proceed at haste when funding is available. Construction is anticipated to take two years to complete and be fully open to the public in the summer of 2022.

Other Considerations

Otter Tail County has over 1,000 lakes, and a well-established tourism infrastructure. Despite that fact, it only has one leg of state recreational trail, a 21-mile leg of Central Lakes Trail in the SW corner of the county. This proposed 27-mile trail will run through the heart of the county, and will be on/near 25 named lakes. Significantly, future plans call for a 21-mile leg to connect to Central Lakes and a 13-mile leg to Heartland Trail, which is already connected to Paul Bunyan Trail. These interconnects would create a 275-mile system encompassing a significant portion of central and western Minnesota.

There is considerable momentum for the Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail.

- The East Segment has been funded and construction will begin spring 2020 with a local investment of \$1,162,500.
- The West and Silent Lakes Segments have also been funded, pending final LCCMR and GMRPTC legislative approval with a local investment of \$3,767,210.
- The Otter Tail County Board of Commissioners has approved \$818,000 to ensure the McDonald Segment is shovel ready in the event state bonding is approved in 2020. The planning, detailed engineering and property acquisition is underway. State bonding approval for the McDonald Segment will provide funding for the final segment located outside of Maplewood State Park.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Otter Tail County will not need additional state subsidies to operate and provide routine maintenance items. The County may seek additional subsidies to provide for major maintenance items for the asset.

Who will own the facility?

Otter Tail County

Who will operate the facility?

Otter Tail County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

NA

Public Purpose

Multi-purpose trail will have full public accessibility, including ADA compliance. Perham and Pelican Rapids both have significant tourism infrastructure, and destination trail users will help stimulate these businesses.

This amenity will also help attract and retain a diverse workforce which is greatly needed as this corridor has seen significant economic growth and forecasts are predicting a worker shortage in the years to come.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous trail appropriations

Project Contact Person

Charles Grotte
County Engineer
218-998-8475
cgrotte@co.ottertail.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.978 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Perham to Pelican Rapids Regional Trail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,978 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,978 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,956 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,206 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,956 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Oberstar Trail Segment | 1 | GO | 650 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 650 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 650 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 0 | 0 |

Oberstar Trail Segment**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$650**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$650,000 in state bonding funds and \$250,000 of the remaining funds from the 2014 State Appropriation (Chapter 312 -HF 3172) is requested to construct a 1.9-mile section of the James L. Oberstar State Trail in Pine County.**Project Description**

This 1.9-mile paved trail construction will work to close the 22-mile trail gap between the North Branch Sunrise Prairie Trail and the Hinckley Munger Trail. The completion of this gap will provide a trail connection from the Twin Cities to the Twin Ports, making this trail regionally significant. Additionally, one of the main objectives identified in the 2017 Pine County Comprehensive Plan is economic development, as Pine County is economically distressed community (in the 2017 American Community Survey Pine County is 80/87 for median household income). This trail will bring economic opportunity to this area that is much needed.

This 8' wide trail section will be constructed per DNR standards and be separated from the roadway for safety and run along the east side of Pine C.S.A.H. No. 9 (see map). The total cost of the project is anticipated to be \$1,250,000 with the key funding sources of state bonding funds, the 2014 State Appropriation for the development of this trail, County funds, and County in-kind engineering and project oversight. Once this section is complete, Pine County does plan to build additional segments in future years (see map), therefore the project will gradually close the gap between North Branch and Hinckley.

Project Rationale

The necessity of the trail is best described by the Vision Statement in the Master Plan (Page 9):

“The James L. Oberstar State Trail will complete important trail connections for multiple uses to provide recreational opportunities for area residents and visitors throughout all seasons. People will have opportunities to experience natural, cultural, and scenic resources. The trail will be a safe and accessible complement to bike routes, improving mobility and providing opportunities for people of all experience levels, including long-distance cyclists and families with children. The trail will promote health living, quality of life, preservation of natural and cultural resources, and tourism.”

Project Timeline

The preliminary engineering has been completed as an in-kind service by the Pine County Engineer. The final design and right-of-way acquisition is expected to be complete in December 2021 and construction will begin in June/July 2022 in conjunction with a reconstruction C.S.A.H. No. 9. This project should occur concurrently with the road reconstruction project as additional right-of-way purchases will be completed for the road construction project, making right-of-way acquisitions for the trail less difficult. Construction is expected to be complete in the Fall of 2022.

Other Considerations

N/A

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The ongoing maintenance will be done by Pine County, therefore no new or additional state operating dollars will be requested for this project

Who will own the facility?

Pine County

Who will operate the facility?

Pine County Public Works will maintain the trail.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The users will be area residents and visitors, as this will be a regionally significant trail given its connection to both the twin cities and the twin ports.

Public Purpose

The public purpose of the trail is to provide recreational opportunities, provide alternative transportation options, improve mobility, and provide economic opportunities by increasing tourism for an economically distressed community (2017 American Community Survey Pine County is 80/87 for median household income).

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous bonding appropriations have been made to this project. In 2014, the legislature appropriated \$350,000 for the “development” of this trail (Chapter 312 - HF No. 3172), of which \$100,000 has been spent to date on completing the master plan.

Project Contact Person

Kelly Schroeder
County Auditor-Treasurer
320-591-1668
kelly.schroeder@co.pine.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$650,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Oberstar Trail Segment

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$650 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,250 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,250 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Plymouth Creek Center | 1 | GO | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 15,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 15,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 15,000 | 0 | 0 |

Plymouth Creek Center

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$15,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Plymouth requests a matching contribution of \$15 million for expansion and renovation of the Plymouth Creek Center, a multi-use facility that includes an activity center, the Fieldhouse dome and the Millennium Garden.

Project Description

The City of Plymouth is requesting a matching contribution of \$15 million in capital appropriations to offset the cost of approximately \$52 million in renovations and expansion to the Plymouth Creek Center. The bond proceeds will be used for the predesign, design, construction, equipping and furnishing the renovation and expansion of the 20-year old Plymouth Creek Center (PCC). Remaining funding for the project will be with general obligation debt. The facility was constructed in 1999 and is in need of a renovation and expansion to meet the current and future demand of a growing community with infrastructure that is continually maintained and operated as a public asset to the region and state.

The Plymouth Creek Center (PCC) is a local, regional and state venue for programs, rentals and events serving 300,000 annual visitors. PCC currently provides approximately 30,000 square feet of indoor space and includes meeting rooms, conference rooms, ballroom, and theater. In 2018, the center hosted more than 150 regional events and served as a meeting space for major events from large companies like Boston Scientific, the Minneapolis Heart Institute, Polaris, U.S. Foods and more. Statewide agencies also frequently use the facility for training and conference space, such as the Freshwater Society, Minnesota Recreation and Park Association, Special Olympics and more.

The major components of the renovation will address facility and site improvements, mechanical systems, appropriate programming space, dedicated senior space, rental facilities, gymnasiums, indoor playground and indoor track. The renovation will encompass the entire 29,310 square foot facility while the addition will provide 82,100 square feet of new indoor space to the existing building for a total of 111,410 square feet.

Project Rationale

The Plymouth Creek Center opened in 2000. The finished 18,000 sq. ft. space consisted of a lobby area, offices, a small conference room, two meeting rooms, bathrooms, a catering kitchen, Fireside Room, and the Plymouth Ballroom. In 2006, the lower level of the PCC was completed bringing the facility to approximately 30,000 square feet. The lower level space consists of the Black Box Theater, a conference room, a meeting room and two small music rooms.

The vision and design of the Plymouth Creek Center began in 1997, with the ultimate goal of meeting the current and future recreation needs of all age groups for the next 15-20 years. Twenty years later, the PCC is still a well-used community space with over 300,000 annual visitors. Even though the PCC

is valued and well utilized, it is not without its challenges. The size and types of spaces do not meet current and future needs of regional conferences and a growing community that services four school districts with a population of more than 380,000 with an appetite for active recreation programs and services.

The PCC reaches many user groups on a yearly basis including Parks and Recreation programming, corporate and private renters and city users. In 2018, there were nearly 4,000 registered bookings at the activity center, generating over 11,880 hours in reservations. Parks and Recreation programs contributed to 80% of those total bookings, whereas private renters and other city users provided the remaining 20%.

Primary building functions include rental events with catering services, senior groups and programs, and a host of recreation programs for all age groups, including arts, music, dance, wellness/fitness, educational classes, and more. The Plymouth Creek Center complex serves as a hub for arts, recreation programming, wellness, agency trainings and other regional events. The Creek Center offers an array of programming for people from infants to senior citizens.

In 2018, one of five users of the complex were from cities other than Plymouth. Regional cultural events such as Primavera and the Plymouth Arts Fair exhibit the works of artists from across the state and beyond. In 2018, the center hosted more than 150 regional events and served as a meeting space for major events from large companies like Boston Scientific, the Minneapolis Heart Institute, Polaris, U.S. Foods and more. Statewide agencies also frequently use the facility for training and conference space, such as the Freshwater Society, Minnesota Recreation and Park Association, Special Olympics and more. As population in the Plymouth area grows, so does the demand for services at the 20-year-old Creek Center.

A recent feasibility study examined growing concerns about the Creek Center's ability to meet current and future needs. The study confirmed a shrinking ability to serve the area. To meet growing demand, the City of Plymouth requests a matching contribution of \$15 million to offset the cost of a renovation and expansion project. A project will enhance the center's ability to host athletics, regional conferences and other programs that provide benefit well beyond Plymouth's borders. An expansion would also boost the center's ability to serve as a wellness hub for students and seniors – offering athletics, activities and classes that promote well-being. This is increasingly important as the population of the four school districts serving Plymouth grows to more than 380,000.

Project Timeline

- July 2019 - Schematic Design Complete
- August – December 2019 – Design Development
- January – May 2020 – Construction Documents
- June – July 2020 – Bid Process
- July 2020 – Bonding Notification
- July/August 2020 – Award Bid
- August 2020 – August 2022 – Remodel/Construction

Other Considerations

This is truly a Capital Investment.

All of these essential items will have life of 20 years or longer. This is a capital investment in the truest sense.

Local Match.

The City of Plymouth will pay over one half of the total project costs.

Plymouth: A Proven Partner.

Plymouth has proven itself to be a good steward of state tax dollars.

- Plymouth parlayed the state’s original \$350,000 investment for the Plymouth Ice Center in 1996 into a regional amenity and state asset.
- The City of Plymouth has committed more than \$15 million in local funding to renovate and expand the Plymouth Creek Center.
- Plymouth taxpayers stepped up. Local taxpayers were asked to fund the PCC in March of 1998 and they did by approving a referendum.
- Over the years, the City of Plymouth has delivered on the taxpayer investment by developing and maintaining a local, state and regional asset.

The City of Plymouth is a responsible partner.

- Carefully balanced our revenue and expenditures
- State dollars will only fund items that will have a useful life of 20 years or more. These are solid capital investments.

Plymouth has proven its commitment to the region and state through its construction, operation and expansion of the Plymouth Creek Center.

- We are asking that state lawmakers give our relatively modest request the same consideration given to other regional centers and facilities.
- We ask that the state recognize that commitment by granting our request for \$15 million to address renovation and expansion at the Plymouth Creek Center.
- Doing so will benefit over a million yearly visitors who will travel across the state to the Plymouth Creek Center.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional state operating dollars.

Who will own the facility?

City of Plymouth

Who will operate the facility?

City of Plymouth

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Plymouth

Public Purpose

The Plymouth Creek Center complex serves as a hub for arts, recreation programming, wellness, agency training's and other regional events. The Creek Center offers an array of programming for people from infants to senior citizens. In 2018, one of five users of the complex were from cities other than Plymouth. Regional cultural events such as Primavera and the Plymouth Arts Fair exhibit the works of artists from across the state and beyond. In 2018, the center hosted more than 150 regional events and served as a meeting space for major events from large companies like Boston Scientific, the Minneapolis Heart Institute, Polaris, U.S. Foods and more. Statewide agencies also frequently use the facility for training and conference space, such as the Freshwater Society, Minnesota Recreation and Park Association, Special Olympics and more. As population in the Plymouth area grows, so does

the demand for services at the 20-year-old Creek Center.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Diane Evans
Director of Parks and Recreation
763-509-5201
devans@plymouthmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$15 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Plymouth Creek Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$37,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$52,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$3,093 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$44,158 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$4,749 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$52,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Prairie Lake Youth JPB

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| School and Recreation Center | 1 | GO | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,058 | 0 | 0 | 1,058 | 0 | 0 |

School and Recreation Center

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,058

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: Adding a recreation area and academic classrooms to our buildings.

Project Description

PLYP is owned and operated by a Joint Powers Agreement between 5 Counties. Those being Kandiyohi, Chippewa, Yellow Medicine, Lac qui Parle and Swift Counties. with all having each 20% ownership. We have operated for 28 years with out any Indoor Gross Motor Recreation Area. With this opportunity it will give us the ability to create a space for our school which would be ADA approved with an elevator also. We would be adding more classrooms for our school and make it more appropriate for the school to provide more schooling. This would give us the opportunity to add more bathrooms especially for the teachers to have there own bathrooms. This will give us the opportunity that we don't have when it come to providing better schooling.

Project Rationale

Over the past 5 years we have had about serving resident from 40 counties in Minnesota through the Probation Departments. Which was a total of about 700 residents per year.

Project Timeline

We should be done with the project by the time the year ends 2022

Other Considerations

I do not know how it will be working with the Historical Registry when adding on to these buildings

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none that I can think of.

Who will own the facility?

Kandiyohi County

Who will operate the facility?

Prairie Lakes Youth Programs

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Prairie Lakes Youth Programs

Public Purpose

Criminal Residents sent to us by the courts.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Darin Balken
Executive Director
320-231-1729
dbplyp@plypsecure.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.058 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

Prairie Lake Youth JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

School and Recreation Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,558 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$35 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$123 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,558 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | N/A |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Multi-use Government Center | 1 | GO | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 6,000 | 0 | 0 |

Multi-use Government Center**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$6,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$6,000,000 dollars in state funds requested to design and construct a new multi purpose government center. |

Project Description

New multi purpose governmental center housing:

Local Government

New Salt/Sand Dome

Public Utilities

School District - Community Education

Non Profit Organization - District Food Shelf

Local government and public works facilities would encompass 32,000 square feet of the facility. Completion of this project would also include necessary parking and utility connections.

Project Rationale

Current facility is located in a flood plain, adjacent to a trout stream (salt dome located right next to trout stream). Site is too small to allow for necessary expansion and current facilities are experiencing many structural deficiencies in the roof, mechanical equipment and building itself.

The ability to have all partners located on one site increases operational efficiency.

Project Timeline

Design completion - October 2020

Project Bid - March 2021

Bid Award - May 2021

Construction Begin - June 2021

Project Completion -December 2022

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

City of Proctor

Who will operate the facility?

City of Proctor

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Proctor School District Non Profit Organizations Public Utilities Commission

Public Purpose

Providing public services to the City of Proctor, School District, Non-profits, and surrounding Townships.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Mark Casey
Administrator
218-628-6261
mcasey@proctormn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$6 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Multi-use Government Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$12,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$11,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$12,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Ramsey County

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Riverfront Property - Riversedge Land Lid | 1 | GF | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ramsey and Washington County Recycling and Energy Center Next Generation Technology Upgrades | 2 | GO | 21,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area | 3 | GO | 2,127 | 0 | 0 | 2,127 | 0 | 0 |
| Interstate Highway 35E and County Road J Interchange | 4 | GO | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project | 5 | GO | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverview Corridor | 6 | GO | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Twin Cities Milwaukee Chicago Second Train | 7 | GO | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gibbs Farm - Pathways to Dakota and Pioneer Life Program Expansion | 8 | GO | 7,130 | 0 | 0 | 7,130 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 86,757 | 0 | 0 | 9,257 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 40,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 46,757 | 0 | 0 | 9,257 | 0 | 0 |

Riverfront Property - Riversedge Land Lid

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$40,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$40 million in state funds is requested for the acquisition, design and construction of a “land lid” that will provide a physical connection of public space between downtown Saint Paul along Kellogg Boulevard and the Mississippi River along Shepard Road. The land lid will be integral to the \$950 million Riversedge private redevelopment project on the site of the former West Publishing buildings and Ramsey County Jail.

Project Description

Riversedge is a multi-tower, phased new construction project that includes nearly 400 residential units, a 140-room hotel, supporting retail spaces, and at least 320,000 GSF of Class A office space with opportunity to build an additional 600,000 GSF. The overall \$950 million project also includes a 1,450-space underground parking ramp along the downtown Saint Paul Mississippi riverfront to serve the site and downtown generally.

The \$83 million land lid extends the existing site’s usable space from five to 12 acres, physically surrounding and supporting the development and extending downtown Saint Paul over existing road and railroad directly to the Mississippi River edge. The lid will serve as an integral facet of a larger public realm network including city and regional parks and trails; streets, plazas and skyways; the Capital City Bikeway; and the City of Saint Paul’s River Balcony. For residents, employees and visitors, the project provides a unique public connection on a signature site that showcases the natural beauty of the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area and the river’s relationship with the Capitol City.

Key funding sources for the overall project include a projected \$860+ million in private funding and \$40 million in state funding for the land lid. All additional public funding will be provided by Ramsey County and sought from other public funding sources. Ramsey County has invested \$17 million in the deconstruction of the former jail and West buildings and is exploring all available economic development tools to develop this regionally-significant project.

Project Rationale

The Riversedge project will extend downtown Saint Paul directly to the Mississippi River, creating nearly seven acres of new public realm space as a signature attraction and also facilitating hundreds of millions of dollars in vibrant private development. The project will also support the creation of over 5,000 jobs.

The Riversedge redevelopment project unlocks new opportunities to increase tax base generation and job creation and facilitate greater integration of public realm and private development that is befitting of this unique regional development site.

As an anchoring, transformative physical amenity within this long-vacant hardscape, the land lid supports an exciting new residential, hotel, office and retail development connected by public space to

the Mississippi River and downtown Saint Paul that will attract residents, workers and visitors for decades to come.

Project Timeline

January-July, 2019 - Predesign
August, 2019-August, 2020 - Final Design and Engineering
September, 2020 – Construction Start - Project One (Lid, Parking, Tower 1 and 2)
September, 2022 – Construction Completion – Project One
July, 2022 – Construction Start – Project Two (Lid, Parking, Tower 3)
July, 2024 – Construction Completion – Project Two

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none.

Who will own the facility?

This request for state funding is for project infrastructure costs only.

Who will operate the facility?

This request for state funding is for project infrastructure costs only.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This request for state funding is for project infrastructure costs only. The land lid will be available for year-round public access and use.

Public Purpose

This project will significantly increase employment and the public tax base in Saint Paul and Ramsey County and will provide public space and recreational amenities along the downtown riverfront.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous state appropriations for this Property or Project.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer O'Rourke
Director of Government Relations
651-724-3461
Jennifer.O'Rourke@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Riverfront Property - Riversedge Land Lid

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$43,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$83,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$83,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$83,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Ramsey and Washington County Recycling and Energy Center Next Generation Technology Upgrades

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$21,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 2 |
| Project Summary: | \$21 million in state funds is requested for Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Center in Newport, MN to construct an expansion to the tipping floor and purchase and install equipment to recover recyclables and organics (food waste) from trash. This request is for half of the projected capital expenses associated with the project. |

Project Description

Background

The Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board (R&E Board) is a joint powers board created by Ramsey and Washington counties and includes nine elected county commissioners: five from Ramsey County and four from Washington County. Two ex-officio non-voting members represent the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and the City of Newport.

The goal of the R&E Board is to manage waste to best protect health and the environment. The guiding principles used by the R&E Board in its decision-making are:

- Plan for a 20- to 30-year horizon
- Build on the current system and allow changes in processing to emerge over time
- Assure flexibility
- Manage risks
- Pivot the view from “waste” to “resources” to add value to the local economy and the environment

Ramsey and Washington counties have partnered through a series of joint powers agreements on waste management issues since the 1980s. One such partnership jointly administered a service agreement with private owners of the Ramsey/Washington Resource Recovery Project waste processing facility, located in Newport, Minnesota. The facility is designed to manage up to 500,000 tons per year of mixed municipal solid waste, recycle metals, and produce refuse-derived fuel to produce electricity at two Xcel Energy power plants.

In late 2015, the R&E Board purchased the facility, now called the Recycling & Energy Center (R&E Center). Following an extensive evaluation, the counties determined that public ownership of the facility and the use of waste designation would provide greater stability to the solid waste management system in the East Metro, enabling significant progress in recovering resources from waste and reducing landfilling.

The R&E Center is a publicly owned and operated 1,500 ton-per-day resource recovery facility. It operates 24 hours per day, 364 days per year (two eight-hour processing shifts and one eight-hour maintenance shift). Municipal solid waste (MSW) is tipped by haulers onto a floor the size of a football

field and is fed into two processing lines that shred and sort the material. The R&E Center recovers metals for recycling and produces refuse-derived fuel (RDF), which is currently used by Xcel Energy power plants to generate enough electricity to power 40,000 homes each year.

The R&E Board plans to improve and update the R&E Center to recover more recyclable materials and develop alternate markets for materials produced at the R&E Center. Preliminary engineering design has been completed to add state-of-the art technology for this purpose. These projects will require moving some current equipment, replacing other equipment, and building new space for equipment and storage.

Project Scope

A preliminary engineering design has been prepared by the R&E Board, which includes the scope and costs. That design, drafted by Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC., underwent an engineering peer review by SCS Engineers. Both documents have been uploaded to CBS and may also be found here: <http://morevaluelesstrash.com/investing-in-the-future>.

The purposes of the enhancements are to:

1. Process a portion of the MSW delivered to the R&E Center to recover residential organics, such as food waste, through a durable compostable bag (DCB) recovery system.
2. Increase the recovery of recyclables, specifically #1 PET plastic, #2 HDPE plastic, corrugated cardboard, ferrous metals and non-ferrous metals, from the mixed MSW before processing the remaining MSW to create refuse-derived fuel.

The preliminary design presents a processing system to manage 225,000 tons of MSW for DCB recovery and 194,000 tons of MSW for recyclables recovery. The processing enhancements would be located adjacent to the current waste processing system and within the existing R&E Center property. The project involves expanding the existing tipping floor building to the north, modifying the existing building, and installing a process line to recover DCBs and another process line to recover the targeted recyclables.

The use of DCBs is likely to be the most efficient and cost-effective method of collecting organics from residential and commercial waste generators. The counties will initially establish residential curbside collection using DCBs across both counties. An aggressive goal of 40% participation by residents has been established, which is about 127,480 of the approximately 319,000 households in the two counties. This would result, at program maturity, in about 30,595 tons of collected organics being composted or anaerobically digested annually.

There are four components to the DCB method of curbside organics collection:

1. Providing the durable compostable bags (DCBs)
2. Co-collection of DCBs with MSW
3. Separation of DCBs from MSW
4. Marketing of separated organic material to an anaerobic digestion or compost facility

Under this system for curbside organics recycling, residents would register for the program and receive a year's supply of DCBs. Residents would sort organics, such as food scraps, in their homes (similar to how one sorts their recyclables), place the organic waste into a DCB and tie the bag closed. The DCB would be placed into the resident's trash cart, to be collected by their trash hauler on their scheduled garbage day. Trash haulers will deliver waste to either transfer stations or the R&E Center, in the same way they do currently. The DCBs, containing organic waste, would then be separated from the MSW. After separation from MSW, the DCBs would be delivered to composting or anaerobic digestion facilities. The remaining MSW would be processed at the R&E Center.

For separation of DCBs at the R&E Center, the preliminary design adds space to the north end of the R&E Center tipping floor, where haulers would tip loads of MSW that contain DCBs. MSW would be loaded onto conveyors and proceed through a series of separators that would use robotic arms to mechanically remove the DCBs from the MSW. MSW would then be conveyed to equipment for recovery of recyclables. DCBs would be hauled to an end market (anaerobic digestion or compost facility).

The R&E Board also plans to install pre-processing equipment at the R&E Center to recover recyclables that remain in MSW, and as a complement to the ferrous and non-ferrous recovery systems already in operation. Equipment would be added to the existing space in the processing building at the R&E Center to recover recyclables before waste proceeds into the processing lines. At this time, the focus is to recover plastics #1 and #2, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, and corrugated cardboard for recycling. Separation of organic waste is also being evaluated.

The proposed design for the recyclables recovery system fits into space that was originally included in the building for a possible third processing line. The design capacity of this system is to process about 194,000 tons of MSW per year. This includes most of the MSW that will be processed to remove DCBs, as well as other loads identified as likely to contain recyclables. This quantity of MSW was selected, rather than all tons processed, because it targets residential waste and selected commercial waste most likely to contain recyclables.

The way this system would be utilized would be to recover recyclables that were not separated for recycling at the source (in residents' homes or businesses) and instead placed into a trash container. Trash haulers would collect MSW as they currently do, and that material would be delivered to the R&E Center. The proposed recyclables recovery system at the R&E Center would separate and recover the recyclable materials from the trash prior to processing. Magnets, eddy current separators, disc screens and optical sorting technology will allow for ferrous metals (such as steel), non-ferrous metals (such as aluminum), corrugated cardboard, PET plastic (such as water bottles) and HDPE plastic (such as milk jugs) to be separated from MSW. These materials will be baled by type and sold to end markets to be recycled into new products. Organic waste is also planned for recovery in this system. This material would be composted to create soil amendments or processed by an anaerobic digester to generate biogenic natural gas (biogas).

A process flow diagram is included in the preliminary engineering design documents (attached with this application), which outlines the specific types of equipment to be installed as a part of the proposed project. The design estimates the recovery of up to 33,000 tons of recyclables annually.

Project Costs & Funding Sources

The projected costs are as follows:

Expansion of tipping floor, equipment and construction manager (CM)/architect-engineering (AE) for DCB Processing: \$19,286,000
Equipment, installation and CM/AE for Recyclables Recovery System: \$23,575,000
Total Project Cost: \$42,861,000

This project will be financed 50% by this state bonding request for \$21 million. Remaining project cost will be financed by the R&E Board, using funds loaned by Ramsey and Washington counties that are raised by long-term fixed rate debt and general obligation bonding by the counties, using the 27% Washington County/73% Ramsey County allocation outlined in the joint powers agreement.

Creation of Jobs

This project will create 18 permanent union jobs. The R&E Board currently employs 50 union and 9

non-union employees at the R&E Center. The new jobs include:

Both DCB and Recyclables Recovery – 6 total

- An electrician for all 3 shifts (3 electricians)
- A maintenance/mechanic for all 3 shifts (3 maintenance staff)

DCB System – 7 total

- 2 operators in the day and 2 in the afternoon (4 operators)
- 1 processor helper for all 3 shifts (3 helpers)

Recyclable Recovery System - 5 total

- 1 operator in the day and 1 in the afternoon (2 operators)
- 1 processor helper for all 3 shifts (3 helpers)

Project Rationale

The two counties are strongly pursuing waste reduction and recycling to meet state goals. The counties have made plans to upgrade the R&E Center to better recover recyclables and organic waste and move away from using refuse-derived fuel (RDF) for electrical generation, instead using RDF for production of transportation fuels and other products through gasification.

Minnesota waste management statutes indicate a preference for recycling and energy recovery over landfilling and include a 75% recycling goal for the metropolitan area. Ramsey and Washington counties have worked jointly since the 1980s to implement a fully integrated waste management system in the East Metro. Most recently, the two counties, through the R&E Board, purchased the resource recovery facility that serves the two counties, with the intent to significantly upgrade the facility. That facility, now called the Recycling & Energy Center, receives and processes over 450,000 tons per year of mixed municipal solid waste (MSW), recovers metals for recycling and produces refuse-derived fuel, which is used by Xcel Energy at two of its power plants (in Red Wing and Mankato) to generate renewable electricity.

Since the R&E Center was purchased, the counties have successfully implemented waste designation, and, through contracts and ordinances, all MSW generated in the two counties is delivered to the R&E Center. The R&E Board has partnered with privately-owned transfer stations to receive a portion of the MSW, which is then delivered to the R&E Center, ensuring a more efficient collection system in the two counties.

Ramsey and Washington counties support a fully integrated waste and recycling system. To get the most value from waste, a variety of methods need to be used. For recyclables, the best method that gets the most value for materials is source-separation by residents and businesses. The counties, through the R&E Board and independently, continue to invest significant resources into source-separation and recycling programs and will continue to do so. But, despite decades of work, recyclable materials remain in the trash. Hence the need for a second line of recovery: pre-processing waste to remove recyclables.

Ramsey and Washington counties have specific recyclables recovery goals. The proposed DCB processing system and recyclables recovery system are designed to facilitate Ramsey and Washington counties achieving the 75 percent recycling goal by:

1. Recovery of residentially-collected (and eventually commercial) organics including:
 - composting
 - energy generation through anaerobic digestion (AD) and utilization of the AD digestate through

composting

2. Recovery of ferrous and non-ferrous metals, #1 PET and #2 HDPE plastics and corrugated cardboard from MSW prior to processing for RDF. Additionally, organic-rich materials, a subset of the residuals generated through the processing system that have a high organic content, may also be recovered via the proposed system.

The R&E Board has conducted various analyses of the waste stream and options for recovering significantly more resources at the R&E Center as part of its plan to reach the state's 75 percent recycling goal by 2030. A listing of those studies can be found on this page of R&E's website: <http://morevaluelesstrash.com/investing-in-the-future>.

The composition of the residential and commercial MSW delivered to the facility was most recently analyzed by the R&E Board via a contract with Foth Infrastructure & Environment, LLC in 2013. That analysis showed that a significant portion of the MSW was organic material that could be recovered for composting or anaerobic digestion. There was also substantial corrugated cardboard found in commercial MSW. R&E is in the process of further analyzing the potential to recover methane using anaerobic digestion of organic material separated from waste, with preliminary results showing good potential for this technology.

The policy basis for this work is well-established. The counties have a Joint Designation Plan approved by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), which ensures the flow of mixed municipal solid waste generated in the two counties to the R&E Center. Both counties have aligned their solid waste management master plans to indicate their intent to add technology to the R&E Center to increase recycling.

In 2016-2017, following purchase of the R&E Center, the counties prepared revisions to their respective Solid Waste Management Master Plans and aligned significant portions of those plans. Included were policies and strategies that addressed emerging technologies that reflected the Scope for Resource Management prepared in 2014, as well as the extensive programming to increase source separation of recyclables. The Commissioner of the MPCA has approved those plans.

The body of work that supported purchase of the R&E Center included over 30 studies and reports, with a focus that went beyond the facility to address what the future of waste/resource management in the East Metro should look like.

In their Solid Waste Management Master Plans, the counties envision that the R&E Center will be a key element in future recovery of resources and will include processing of waste to further recover recyclables. The counties also envision work with the private sector to transition away from the combustion of RDF to its use to produce biofuels or biochemicals, and the development of capacity for anaerobic digestion of organic waste. These plans will move the East Metro area toward a more circular economy, better capturing the resource value of materials discarded as waste.

Project Timeline

Summer 2019:

R&E Board will act to:

Approve the financing plan

- Indicate a preferred method for local funding for the identified projects
- Upon identification of appropriate budget adjustments by the JLT, authorize funding using R&E funds for construction manager (CM) and architect/engineering (AE) services to start pre-construction work in order to be prepared to seek contractor bids in mid-2020

Approve the procurement plan

- Approve, without final commitments, and subject to availability of funding, the procurement plan and timeline
- Pending available funding, authorize the R&E leadership to solicit CM and AE services for the processing enhancement project

December 2019:

R&E Board will act to approve contract(s) with construction manager(s) and architect(s)/engineer(s) for preconstruction work. Preconstruction services and design work will begin.

May-July 2020:

Evaluation of results of state bonding process and action on appropriate next steps depending on outcome of legislative session will occur.

June-September 2020:

State grant documents will be completed and signed. R&E Board will solicit project contractors upon completion of state grant documents.

October 2020-June 2022:

Construction, commissioning and acceptance testing will occur.

June 2022

Project operations commence.

Other Considerations

In addition to the rationale and public purpose that have been discussed in this application, the proposed project to construct enhancements to the R&E Center to recover recyclables and organics (food waste) from trash is innovative and collaborative, promotes equity and economic development, and fosters sustainable recycling systems in the greater Twin Cities metropolitan region.

Innovation

- This project is forward-looking, embarking on a system to get more value from waste for the next generation.
- The project creates more value from waste, capturing approximately 64,000 tons annually for recycling, composting or anaerobic digestion that would otherwise be landfilled or incinerated.
- This is innovative, using cutting-edge technology and providing an example to other Minnesota counties.
- This work implements state waste management policy, and within the system that is planned and implemented by the counties, will protect health and the environment, conserve natural resources and energy, and implement the state waste management hierarchy.

Collaboration & Partnership

- The R&E Board is a leading example of two political subdivisions that are collaborating in providing a necessary public service.
- A key element of the system this project would create is public/private partnerships. The counties will be working with the private sector in the collection, transfer, processing and marketing of organic waste.

Equity

- The organics processing system, by providing a distribution system for bags to residents, and combined with existing trash collection service, provides equity and inclusiveness in service delivery in an affordable manner.

Economic Development

- The completion of this project creates 18 new permanent union jobs at the R&E Center in Newport, MN.
- Increasing recycling will help develop and support stronger Minnesota markets, especially for organics.

Fostering Sustainable Recycling Systems

- This project advances progress toward the regional recycling goal of 75% by 2030.
- This project, in conjunction with associated new programs that will reach all communities throughout both counties, provides a tremendous educational opportunity to promote waste reduction, reuse and recycling.
- With waste designation in place, which ensures a supply of raw material, the resource conservation benefits of the project are assured, and will last well into the future.
- Recycling is the gateway toward a circular economy, and this project is a significant step forward in that direction.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No other state funding for operating expenses will be requested. All operating expenses associated with this project are funded by tipping fees charged at the R & E Center.

Who will own the facility?

Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board (Ramsey County and Washington County)

Who will operate the facility?

Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board (Ramsey County and Washington County)

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Ramsey/Washington Recycling & Energy Board will use the facility to process all municipal solid waste (MSW) generated by residents and businesses located in Ramsey and Washington counties.

Public Purpose

The proposed project to install next generation technology upgrades at the R & E Center in Newport will serve the public directly. The facility is, and will continue to be, owned and operated by two political subdivisions of the state, Ramsey County and Washington County. The Waste Management Act (115A.02) establishes the public purpose for waste management in Minnesota: <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/115A.02>. As such, managing solid waste is recognized as a necessary public service. Counties are the unit of government held accountable for waste management planning and implementation in the state. The R & E Center is part of an integrated system designed to meet state goals. MN 473.803 requires metropolitan counties to prepare solid waste management master plans for approval by the commissioner of the MPCA and to implement those plans. Ramsey and Washington counties have aligned their approved master plans. Those plans call for implementation of this project.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No other appropriations have previously been requested.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer O'Rourke
Director of Government Relations
651-266-8007
Jennifer.O'Rourke@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ramsey and Washington County Recycling and Energy Center Next Generation Technology Upgrades

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$21,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$21,861 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$42,861 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,965 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$225 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$39,317 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$225 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$429 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$42,861 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,127

Priority Ranking: 3

Project Summary: This request is for \$2,127,000 in state bond funding to design, construct and equip the Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area located in the City of St. Paul, Ramsey County, with a permanent snow-making system for cross-country skiing, downhill skiing, tubing and sledding.

Project Description

Battle Creek Regional Park is a 1440 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 and a recreational tubing/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 F or less. Key elements of the system will include the installation of cooling towers 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 (mobile equipment items will be provided by Ramsey County as part of the local match); a rope tow for tubing/sliding and a seasonal building to house the pumping station and storage of snowmaking and grooming equipment.

Project Rationale

In 2005, in light of the unpredictable snow conditions at the time, 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. 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 snow in the Metropolitan Area is essential to maintaining participation at Greater Minnesota cross-country ski areas and events such as cross-country ski races. Several area high schools use Battle Creek as their practice and meet location for their cross country ski teams however, with the lack of snow at Battle Creek and no other facilities in the east metro that make snow, practices and meets are often canceled and students are forced to drive to the west metro locations with machine made snow to practice on their own. Battle Creek Regional Park was identified 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 competitions. Battle Creek was the host site for the American Cross-Country Skiers National Masters Ski Race in 2000. Since that time, numerous other regional, state and local events have been planned, but subsequently cancelled due to lack of snow.

Project Timeline

Provided that we obtain funding in the 2020 legislative cycle we would plan on doing design development work beginning in July of 2020, we have an anticipated mid-point construction timeline of October 2021 where we expect to have all community engagement completed, design work completed, operational plans completed, and would be moving into construction with an estimated construction completion timeline of November of 2021.

Other Considerations

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.

The Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area with predictable snow will provide an outstanding, world-class venue for National, State, Regional and local cross-country ski events. These events will draw thousands of athletes and spectators to the region, contribute substantially to Minnesota's tourism income, and position Minnesota to be America's #1 Nordic Skiing Destination.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

Ramsey County

Who will operate the facility?

Ramsey County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Kids and families will be primary users of the sledding hill and people of all ages will be able to utilize cross-country ski trails. People from all across the metro area, the state, and beyond will visit this winter destination for recreation, events, and competitions.

Public Purpose

Parks and Recreation, high school and amateur sports teams. Active public benefits through providing and promoting healthy lifestyles through physical activity resulting in health benefits, higher property values with greater investments at the regional park, economic impact to related businesses, jobs for construction workers, and positive social benefits.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None from state sources

Project Contact Person

Mark McCabe
Director of Parks & Recreation
651-748-2500
mark.mccabe@co.ramsey.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.127 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,127 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,068 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$1,058 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,253 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$786 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,990 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$477 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,253 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Interstate Highway 35E and County Road J Interchange

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,500

Priority Ranking: 4

Project Summary: This request is for design engineering funding to complete the design of the Interstate Highway 35E/County Road J interchange and the segments of County Road J (Ramsey County Road 81, CSAH 60) between Centerville Road and Otter Lake Road, in the cities of Lino Lakes and North Oaks and White Bear Township.

Project Description

The project would design a replacement for an interchange that is functionally obsolete. The interchange currently experiences severe congestion resulting in backups onto the through lanes of I-35E and on the county road system. The new interchange design would provide for multi-modal travel by adding bicycle and pedestrian facilities to an interstate highway bridge that now lacks them and would provide access to I-35E to the north, which is lacking from the current interchange. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has expressed concerns about the backups that extend into the through lanes of I-35E and has been exploring temporary mitigation. This project would design a permanent solution.

Project Rationale

The existing I-35E/County Road J interchange functions poorly, creating severe backups on the I-35E mainline that have resulted in at least one severe crash. The lack of access to and from I-35E to the north has hampered businesses adjacent to the interchange area and has been an impediment to planned development. The delays caused by congestion have created safety issues on I-35E and daily inconvenience for residents and businesses. The lack of bicycle and pedestrian facilities has hampered non-motorized travel through the corridor.

Project Timeline

If funded, the design process could begin in 2020 and be completed in approximately one year. This would accommodate construction as early as 2022, which could be substantially completed in a single construction season.

Other Considerations

The project would address deficiencies that inhibit the expansion of adjacent businesses that rely on access to the Interstate Highway and have hampered other development efforts in the area. It would make the area accessible to bicyclists and pedestrians by providing accommodations where none exist today. This project is strongly supported by the cities of Lino Lakes and North Oaks and by White Bear Township.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

Anoka and Ramsey counties will own the roadway outside of the interchange area. MnDOT will own the interchange bridge and ramps.

Who will operate the facility?

Anoka and Ramsey counties will operate the roads outside of the interchange area; MnDOT will operate the interchange.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The project will improve accessibility of I-35E to the north for all users and will reduce congestion for commuters and commercial users, and make the route accessible for transit. The design will provide facilities to cross I-35E for bicyclists and pedestrians where none exist and the nearest adjacent crossings are over two miles away.

Public Purpose

The project has strong support from the cities of Lino Lakes and North Oaks and from White Bear Township. The proposed design supports the needs of adjacent commercial and industrial enterprises as well as accommodating planned development. In addition to providing increased access to I-35E to and from the north, the congestion reduction afforded by the project is expected to increase safety.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Joseph Lux
Senior Planner
651-266-7114
joseph.lux@co.ramsey.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Interstate Highway 35E and County Road J Interchange

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,500

Priority Ranking: 5

Project Summary: \$2,500,000 in state funds are requested for predesign and design activities for the Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project. This predesign and design work includes preliminary engineering and environmental analysis required for application into the Federal Transit Administration's Capital Investment Grants Program.

Project Description

The Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project is a future 14-mile transportation corridor connecting neighborhoods, healthcare destinations and employment centers. In 2018, the bus rapid transit project that utilizes Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority right-of-way, city streets and State Highway 61 to connect downtown St. Paul with White Bear Lake was adopted into the region's 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. Twenty one stations are planned as part of the project.

In 2018, Ramsey County advanced the project into its next phase, environmental analysis. This three year phase will result in the completion of the engineering and environmental analysis necessary to complete an Environmental Assessment and prepare the project for entry into the Federal Transit Administration's Project Development Phase of their Capital Investment Grants Program.

Project Rationale

The purpose of the Rush Line BRT Project is to provide transit service that satisfies the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public and supports sustainable development within the study area between Saint Paul and White Bear Lake.

The needs the Rush Line BRT Project addresses are:

- Serving the needs of people who rely on transit.
- Meeting increasing demand for reliable, high-frequency transit.
- Planning for sustainable growth and development.
- Expanding multimodal travel options.

Project Timeline

- 2014-2017 Pre-Project Development Study and Identification of the Locally Preferred Alternative
- 2018-2020 Environmental Analysis and Design Development
- 2020-2021 Project Development and Preliminary Engineering
- 2022-2023 Final Engineering
- 2024-2026 Construction

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project is estimated to cost \$8 million a year to operate in 2015 dollars. This cost will be split 50/50 between local governments and the State. The cost estimate does not include any revenue from fares, advertisements or federal funds.

Who will own the facility?

The Metropolitan Council will own the vehicles and infrastructure for the Rush Line Corridor.

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit will operate the corridor.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The general public will utilize the public transit improvements made in the Rush Line Corridor to improve their mobility.

Public Purpose

The Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project is a public transportation investment that will provide improved mobility to all members of the public between Saint Paul and the Northeast Metro. Additionally, through its connectivity to the region's bus and light rail system, residents, particularly those in areas of concentrated poverty, will be provided with increased access to jobs, recreation, education and health care facilities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The Rush Line BRT Project has not received previous state appropriations.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer O'Rourke
Director of Government Relations
651-266-8007
Jennifer.O'Rourke@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$7,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$8,800 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$8,800 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$8,800 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | N/A |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | N/A |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | N/A |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Riverview Corridor

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,500 |
| Priority Ranking: | 6 |
| Project Summary: | \$2,500,000 in state funds is requested for predesign and design activities for the Riverview Corridor. This predesign and design work includes preliminary engineering and environmental analysis required for application to the Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Investment Grants Program. |

Project Description

The Riverview Corridor is a 12-mile planned transportation connection between neighborhoods, anchor destinations and employers in downtown Saint Paul, Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport and the Mall of America. In February, 2019 the modern streetcar route along State Highway 5 (West 7th Street) was adopted into the region’s 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. The planned modern streetcar line includes use of existing Metro Green Line stations and track in downtown Saint Paul and Metro Blue Line stations and track south of the Mississippi river. Nine new stations are planned along State Highway 5 (West 7th Street).

In 2019, Ramsey County will advance the project into its next phase, the Engineering and Pre-environmental Phase. This phase will result in the completion of engineering and environmental data analysis necessary to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement and is anticipated to take three years. The Engineering and Pre-environmental Phase is currently estimated to cost \$14 million. Following the completion of the Engineering and Pre-environmental Phase, the project will complete an Environmental Impact Statement as part of its Project Development Phase.

Funding for the Riverview Corridor is assumed to be provided by the local governments, the state and federal government.

Project Rationale

This project will link growing communities and neighborhoods along the corridor from Union Depot to Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport to the Mall of America in Bloomington. The corridor is forecast to add 32,000 residents and 41,500 jobs by 2040. Additionally, the job and employment growth will be lead to 241,000 new daily trips being made to, from and within the corridor by 2040. This project will increase mobility, stimulate economic development, and preserve community and environmental resources in the area.

Project Timeline

- Engineering and Pre-environmental Phase – 2019 – 2022
- Project Development – 2023 – 2025
- Final Engineering – 2026-2028
- Construction – 2028- 2032

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Riverview Corridor is estimated to cost \$35 million a year to operate in 2027 dollars. This cost will be split 50/50 between local governments and the State. The cost estimate does not include any revenue from fares, advertisements or federal funds.

Who will own the facility?

The Metropolitan Council will own the vehicles and infrastructure for the Riverview Corridor.

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit will operate the corridor.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The general public will utilize the public transit improvements made in the Riverview Corridor to improve their mobility.

Public Purpose

The Riverview corridor is a public transportation investment that will provide improved mobility to all members of the public between downtown Saint Paul, Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Mall of America and the neighborhoods in-between. Additionally, through its connectivity to the region's bus and light rail system, residents, particularly those in areas of concentrated poverty, will be provided with increased access to jobs, recreation, education and health care facilities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no state appropriations to the Riverview Corridor modern streetcar project.

Project Contact Person

Jennifer O'Rourke
Director of Government Relations
651-266-8007
Jennifer.O'Rourke@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Riverview Corridor

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$14,867 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$14,867 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$14,867 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$14,867 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | N/A |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | N/A |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | N/A |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Twin Cities Milwaukee Chicago Second Train

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$10,000

Priority Ranking: 7

Project Summary: \$10 million in state funds to provide non-federal matching funds for the implementation of passenger rail service. The Twin Cities, Milwaukee and Chicago (TCMC) project will introduce a second round trip train between the Union Depot in Saint Paul and Union Station in Chicago along the existing Amtrak Empire Builder alignment.

Project Description

The Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago (TCMC) Passenger Rail Study will complete environmental and design work for introducing a second daily round-trip passenger train between the Twin Cities and Chicago. The \$10 million request will be split providing \$1 million to complete the environmental work and \$9 million for the state's share of final design and construction.

The second train would travel at a maximum speed of 79 miles per hour, following the same route and serving the same cities as Amtrak’s Empire Builder at complementary times and on a more reliable schedule. Minnesota station stops include Saint Paul, Red Wing and Winona. In 2018, Phase 1 of the TCMC study was completed which identified two service alternatives and conceptual design of capital improvements needed to accommodate a second round-trip passenger train on the Empire Builder route. This study, completed in 2018, was funded by the State of Wisconsin, the La Crosse Area Planning Committee and Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority. Funding is needed to complete the environmental documentation and service development plan and to provide funding for a state match toward a future federal grant application for construction.

Project Rationale

A second round-trip passenger train between Saint Paul and Chicago will provide economic, mobility and safety benefits. A second train will boost tourism to Minnesota communities along the Mississippi River and support Minnesota businesses who provide goods and services to Amtrak. A second train will improve mobility by providing a more convenient and reliable transportation option to Minnesota residents, students and businesses. A second train will improve safety by installing updated roadway/railroad crossing warning equipment and utilizing Positive Train Control.

Minn. Stat 174.632 charges MnDOT with planning, design, developing and constructing passenger rail services. The 2015 State Rail Plan further directs MnDOT to lead the development of passenger rail services and participate in the development of a multi-state passenger rail system in the Upper Midwest. MnDOT works in partnership with local governments, neighboring states, community groups and corridor advocates to implement the recommendations of the state rail plan.

Project Timeline

Track and Infrastructure - 2016 - 2018

Service Plan and Environmental Documentation - 2019

Final Design - 2020 -2021

Construction - 2022-2023

Other Considerations

Passenger rail funds can be used with federal or local dollars for project work. The \$26 million in 2009 GO bonding leveraged over \$40 million federal funding. MnDOT has authority to receive and spend federal funds for passenger rail projects. Additionally, Wisconsin Department of Transportation is an active partner with the TCMC project and has identified funding to match Minnesota funds and apply for any of for federal programs that are passenger rail eligible.

Passenger rail projects have shared benefits with the freight rail system by addressing changing infrastructure needs, safety, and capacity constraints. MnDOT has and will continue to develop the expertise within the agency to design, construct, and operate passenger rail services. A key element to implement a passenger rail system is to explore potential alternative funding methods, public/private sector funding opportunities, and potentially private sector project development and operations.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

It is assumed that the owner of the facility will seek state funding to subsidize its operating costs.

Who will own the facility?

The Minnesota Department of Transportation.

Who will operate the facility?

Amtrak or another passenger rail service provider.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The general public will utilize the passenger rail improvements through a second train frequency. The business community will utilize the additional capacity in the freight railroad to increase the speed and reliability of their freight shipments.

Public Purpose

The Twin Cities Milwaukee Chicago second train provides needed improvements to mobility for all members of Minnesota who travel between the Twin Cities, Red Wing, Winona and points in between as well as to stations in Wisconsin and Illinois.

Description of Previous Appropriations

2009: \$26 million GO Bonds

Project Contact Person

Jennifer O'Rourke
Director of Government Relations
651-266-8007
Jennifer.O'Rourke@CO.RAMSEY.MN.US

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Twin Cities Milwaukee Chicago Second Train

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$650 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$650 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$650 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | N/A |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | N/A |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | N/A |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Gibbs Farm - Pathways to Dakota and Pioneer Life Program Expansion

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$7,130 |
| Priority Ranking: | 8 |
| Project Summary: | \$7.13 million in state funds are requested to match local funding to complete design development, construction, and furnishing of new educational, administrative, and preservation buildings and spaces at Gibbs Farm to support educational program reaching 30,000 students and tens of thousands of others individuals annually. |

Project Description

Introduction

Imagine a place that provides extraordinary education, reaches 15,000 students every year, and is the premier location teaching both Dakota Culture and early agricultural history in Minnesota. Imagine a place that does this through a multi-cultural lens, using the stories of real people, and in a hands-on way that integrates the best learning models from museums, classrooms, and theaters in a way proven to be effective and impactful.

Now imagine that place is only available to students twelve weeks a year. Imagine that place is brought to life by a team of incredible educators available and eager to serve more but are limited by the physical limitations of their environment, ultimately limiting their reach to 15,000 students annually.

This is the story of Gibbs Farm: Pathways to Dakota & Pioneer Life (Gibbs Farm), a program of the Ramsey County Historical Society (RCHS). Improving this story will change the lives of tens of thousands of students, educators, and adults every year, boosting academic achievement and helping ensure that today’s students are equipped with the knowledge to be positive contributors to a thriving community for years to come.

Proposal Summary

Gibbs Farm is one of Minnesota’s earliest farm steads and a crossroads for the Dakota people of Cloud Man’s Village. Its significance is such that it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and it was through the efforts of RCHS that the farm was saved and has thrived for 70 years. Comprised of the original farmhouse and historic barn, and supported by replica structures including a soddy, tipi, bark lodge, and school house, the site serves 15,000 students from all across central and southern Minnesota as well as Western Wisconsin. Of the 181 schools that sent students to Gibbs in 2016, 27 were located in Ramsey County and 154 were from further afield. The site draws students and educators from all across west, central, and southern Minnesota, serving the entire region once populated by the Dakota people within the State, making Gibbs Farm a state-wide resource.

Gibbs Farm is a seasonal site without year-round facilities, limiting its effective season for school tours to about twelve weeks a year. This also means that 15,000 students is the maximum capacity for school tours, the core education program on the site. Educators evaluate the programs at Gibbs Farm every year and they hold the programs in high-regard for their quality, impact on student learning, and

alignment with state education standards. In post visit surveys, 98% of teachers rank Gibbs programs as meeting or exceeding their expectations in these areas. Facilities for inclement weather and suitable restrooms are consistently ranked as challenges. Every year there are more tour requests than can be accommodated, this demand is a credit to strong programs thriving despite the insufficiency of comfort and safety facilities. In the event of dangerous weather tours are currently cancelled and while some can be rescheduled, others simply can not be due to the limited time in which the site can support visitors during the typical academic year.

The proposed program expansion will address safety and comfort needs as well as making Gibbs Farm available year-round and increasing its capacity to 30,000 students on school tours annually.

The Gibbs Farm Program and Capital Expansion Project includes:

New After School Program – Based on RCHS’s *Investigate MN!* summer school pilot program (the only museum-based summer school program in Minnesota), a new after-school program will operate at Gibbs Farm Monday through Friday on a year-round basis for up to 200 students each day (including a summer-school option).

Education Program Building - 8,500 sf, two-story building that can serve more than 240 students at the same time, regardless of weather conditions. This facility will also support general visitors, the after school program and up to 300 RCHS and community partner programs annually.

Collections Preservation Building - 3,000 sf, one-story addition to the Red Barn will provide a secure and environmentally controlled space for the 14,000 object artifact collection and the 2.5 million item archival collection entrusted to RCHS by the community.

Education Gallery - 1,500 sf, one-story gallery addition to the Red Barn (above the preservation space) will allow students and visitors to engage closely with artifacts and archives. This space is adjacent to a 1,500 sf open-air program deck.

Plaza – 2,500 sf plaza on the corner of Larpenteur and Cleveland will improve safety for groups crossing from Gibbs Farm to the Bell Museum while also providing a educational space for tours.

Dakota Cultural Space – 1,000 sf of outdoor space adjacent to all-weather shelter in the new Administration building is being set aside for Dakota partners and any indigenous groups or individuals that need space for cultural activities or traditional funerals. This was a direct request by our Dakota partners as no such space currently exists in the Twin Cities. This space will not be a part of a typical visitor experience at the site.

Red Barn – the 2,400 sf Red Barn is being renovated to become a year-round education space with capacity for two classrooms and will be the location of food learning activities and a new hub of restrooms. The space will support winter programming on site as well as at the adjacent Les Bolstad Golf Course operated by the University of Minnesota.

Administration Building – 3,500 sf of dedicated administrative space will be far more efficient than the current arrangement, both in terms of energy use and utilization by staff and volunteers. This space includes a modest amount of shared office space for existing and future partners including Dakota Wicohan.

Other – A bus drop off lane, modestly expanded parking, and substantial landscaping and accessibility improvements are also part of this project and are detailed more in the Master Plan that is attached.

Project Rationale

Education is a top priority for RCHS. This is in direct response to the educational needs in our

community where only 75% of students graduate high school on time and where the achievement gap between poor and affluent students and between students of color and white students is catastrophically high. These statistics reflect several generations of failure to engage all of our community and unless these are improved, they predict a poorer economic future, increased corrections costs, and the continued break down of community.

RCHS would rather be chronicling how our community successfully used education as a key tool to close the achievement gap, build community, and create a brighter economic future for all Minnesotans.

We consistently encounter educators for K-5 students that request help in teaching Minnesota history and indigenous cultural history – two key subjects mandated by state education standards and for which many elementary educators are not sufficiently equipped. As the only historic site in Minnesota that addresses both at a significant scale and does so using a combination of proven best practices for learning from several fields, Gibbs Farm is a key resource and one that should be made available to more Minnesota students, educators, and residents.

Nearly five years ago RCHS started *Investigate MN!*, a six-week summer school program created in partnership with the St. Paul City School. The goal of this program is to help reduce summer learning loss (a leading contributor to the achievement gap) by students with limited access to quality summer programs. Participants have demonstrated dramatic gains in writing and reading skills as part of this program and their connection to the community and its history is substantially enhanced. This program takes students to various cultural institutions across the metro area for two days a week and also includes classroom activities for the other three days. It is the only museum-based summer school in Minnesota. Lessons from this program are directly impacting the planning for the new After School Program that will be part of the Gibbs Farm program expansion.

The value of field trips in education

Two recent studies have directly explored the impact of field trips on student achievement. Both have very large sample sizes and are statistically stable and relevant.

The *Educational Value of Field Trips* (2014) found that 80% of young students could accurately recall and describe the content of their field trip three weeks after their field trip, as well as statistically significant improvements in other performance measures.

A more comprehensive study by Rice University, *Investigating Causal Effects of Arts Education Experience* was published in February 2019. This study ran over two years with a starting sample size of more than 10,000 students. It found that students participating in field trips saw significant improvements across multiple fields.

These impacts are reasons to support an investment in the expansion of the education programming at Gibbs Farm.

Gibbs Farm is a state-wide resource. It provides hands-on education regarding Dakota culture as well as early farming and non-indigenous settler culture. Gibbs is one of only two organizations providing Dakota culture education through student field trips and outreach. The other is the Minnesota Historical Society. Gibbs Farm is unique in that most education occurs outdoors, incorporates proven, participatory theater-based techniques, and every field trip includes a make and take activity. The Dakota program was developed twenty years ago with the guidance of Dakota culture bearers who continue to advise Gibbs Farm today. Gibbs Farm also tells the story of the Gibbs family and their long-standing and positive relationship with the Dakota people of Cloud Man's Village. This cross-cultural experience is also unique to Gibbs Farm and supports critical thinking development as

students study and experience history from multiple perspectives.

Background – Our Work So Far

Ramsey County Historical Society’s Gibbs Farm has been operating at its functional capacity for more than five years. RCHS has been studying site needs and possible solutions for four years and this work has helped inform the strategic plan of RCHS and resulted in the completion of a Site Master Plan in 2018 with the assistance of Cuningham Group Architects. In order to fully address demand from existing student and educator users of the site, and to serve those that cannot currently participate in the Gibbs program, Gibbs Farm needs to operate year-round and current facilities are insufficient to achieve that.

During this planning process RCHS reached out to partners including the Bell Museum, Ramsey County, Dakota Wicohan, and others; as well as individual Dakota culture bearers, educators, and other organizations and stakeholders. This outreach affirmed the need by educators for the educational programs that RCHS provides and that meet State education standards. (All Gibbs Programs address State education standards) More access through a year-round program and the ability to deliver these programs during inclement weather require several new/expanded buildings.

With this added capacity, RCHS expects to continue expanding its partnership work with the Bell Museum, Dakota Wicohan, and many others. RCHS expects to program its new spaces with up to 100 evening programs of its own design and make another 200 evenings available for partner organizations, some of whom have weekly or monthly programming already. This leaves sufficient availability to allow site rentals as a larger revenue stream.

Project Timeline

- July 2016 - December 2018 - Master Planning & Pre-Design (complete)
- July 2019 - June 2020 - Begin Design Development
- July 2020 - July 2021 - Complete Design Development & Engineering
- August 2021-October 2021 - Bids and Contracts Let
- November 2021 - March 2022 - Construction and Primary Landscaping
- April 2022 - Commissioning & Occupancy - Buildings
- March 2022 - May 2022 - Landscape completion

Other Considerations

The time to make this investment is now. The new Bell Museum is introducing 25,000 students and their families to the Gibbs Farm neighborhood every year. Many of these students and families are not current visitors but fit the profile of typical Gibbs guests (both students and multi-generational visitors). Gibbs Farm and the Bell hosted their first joint tour in May 2019, it was a success and will support future growth, if Gibbs has the capacity to serve that growth. The addition of the Bell Museum to the neighborhood brings sufficient critical mass to make the corner of Cleveland and Larpenteur a cultural destination.

Ramsey County has been a great partner of RCHS for 70 years and regularly commits support for key needs. RCHS is asking that the State of Minnesota join with Ramsey County to help make this critical educational resource that already serves students and educators from around the state available to twice as many schools and students.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Ramsey County

Who will operate the facility?

Ramsey County Historical Society

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Ramsey County Ramsey County Historical Society (RCHS) Ramsey County Extension Services Dakota Wicohan - RCHS partner will have a long-term/permanent presence at the site Indigenous/American Indian population - long-term access to the site for cultural activities and funerals. Other partners will access and use the site, including hundreds of public and private schools; universities - including current RCHS partners the University of Minnesota Dakota Language department and the New Bell Museum; as well as community service organizations

Public Purpose

Education, primarily public K-5 students but also private schools, universities (museum studies programs) and home-school groups. These experiences are subsidized by RCHS members and donors, reducing the cost to schools by 55%.

Out of school time learning through the after school program.

The site will gain the capacity to provide training and program space for Ramsey County programs that serve the public, including County Extension and programs related to Health and Human Services.

Preservation of material culture through the enhanced preservation of a National Register of Historic Places site as well as the addition of preservation facilities to ensure community resources are preserved and accessible to the public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Chad Roberts
President
651-222-0701
chad@rchs.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$7.13 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Gibbs Farm - Pathways to Dakota and Pioneer Life Program Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$7,130 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$132 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$70 | \$262 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$6,710 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$88 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$202 | \$14,190 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$70 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$132 | \$1,420 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$253 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$12,517 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$202 | \$14,190 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Ranier Safe Harbor - Transient Dock on Rainy Lake | 1 | GO | 917 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 917 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 917 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Ranier Safe Harbor - Transient Dock on Rainy Lake**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$917**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** To construct a dock in Ranier that would accommodate boats 26 feet or longer with the goal of increasing public access for boat recreation on Rainy Lake and increase economic development opportunities for the area.**Project Description**

To provide tie-up facilities within a safe harbor for transient recreational boaters, a 16 foot wide tee dock design approximately 278 feet long with eight floating fingers has been chosen. The designed dock will provide 18 overnight and 8 daytime slips located on public property owned and managed by the City of Ranier, MN. This marina will provide overnight transient boaters with water, electricity and sewage pump out services. Sufficient water depth (9-11 feet) exists to accommodate large vessels into the marina without dredging or other environmentally disruptive activities. Ranier is at the confluence of Rainy Lake and Rainy River and is considered the gateway to Voyageurs National Park (VNP), a water based park.

Project Rationale

There is a need to construct a facility for transient, recreational boaters on Rainy Lake due to a growing demand for recreational access. The facility would accommodate large vessels 26 feet or greater for limited stays of 14 nights or less and offer amenities such as water, electricity, waste pump-out and lighting. More than 150 houseboats and sailboats are either commercially and privately owned on Rainy Lake. Currently, the only option for moorage is in VNP with single designated tie-up spots in the park. VNP provides for a serene wilderness experience. The proposed facilities would provide safe overnight dockage and land based comforts with access to local dining, shopping and entertainment for Rainy Lake boaters that was never previously available. It will provide a long overdue alternative for transient boaters not seeking a strictly "wilderness" experience in VNP. The facilities would provide a much needed economic boost to the Rainy Lake area.

Project Timeline

Plans, specifications and bid documents for construction completed by 12/2021.
Construction of dock facility completed by 12/2023.

Other Considerations

The city/port of Ranier stands to reap substantial economic benefit from the construction of the transient boat marina, moreover, the neighboring city of International Falls and Koochiching County will also feel the positive economic impact this facility will bring.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

A request for proposal was submitted to the LCCMR for 2020 ENTRF funds.

Who will own the facility?

The city of Ranier.

Who will operate the facility?

The city of Ranier.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Recreational boaters on Rainy Lake.

Public Purpose

The public purpose is to provide economic benefit to the area from recreational boaters access to local waterfront restaurants, pubs and shops. The public purpose is to increase recreational access to Rainy Lake.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Sherril Gautreaux
City Administrator
218-286-3311
cityofranier@frontiernet.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Ranier Safe Harbor - Transient Dock on Rainy Lake

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$917 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$917 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$40 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$45 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$45 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$632 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$155 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$917 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Red Rock Rural Water System

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Lakes Area Regional Expansion Project | 1 | GO | 5,850 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,850 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,850 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Lakes Area Regional Expansion Project**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$5,850**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$5.85 million in state funds is requested to design, construct, furnish and equip a new water source, water treatment plant, a water tower and the installation of approximately 110 miles of 10 inch through 2 inch water main for build a regional expansion of the Red Rock Rural Water System to be built and located in Murray County and Cottonwood County MN. The project will supply Safe drinking water to an area that has water quality parameters that exceeds Primary EPA Drinking Water Standards.**Project Description**

The Lake's Area Regional Project includes the design and construction of the following project components:

1. Construction of 110 miles of 10" thru 2" diameter water main that will deliver good quality drinking water connections to 320 rural homes and businesses in Murray County, the Lake Shetek State Park, and the towns of Avoca and availability to Currie. The benefitting population of the regional project is estimated at 5,100 people.
2. Construction of a new 325 gallon per minute water treatment plant to perform iron and manganese filtration and produce 100 million gallons of water per year. Project components include aeration, detention, gravity filtration, chemical addition, clearwell storage, high service pumping and standby generation.
3. Installation of two municipal production wells that each produce 325 gallons per minute and construction of 2,600 feet of raw water main.
4. Erection of a 300,000 gallon elevated tank near Lake Shetek to provide gravity flow and water storage for the rural distribution system.
5. Implementing SCADA improvements at the new water treatment plant and elevated tank for remote monitoring, security and control.
6. Total project cost will be \$11,900,000 financed through a combination of loan from USDA Rural Development (\$5.65M), local funds in the form of connection fees from rural services and municipalities (\$0.40M), and 50% matching funds from the State of Minnesota (\$5.85M).

Project Rationale

Good Quality Drinking Water is hard to find in Southwest Minnesota. The project area ground water is generally high in mineral content, very hard and often contains arsenic, bacteria or nitrates. Livestock producers deal with high sulfates which effects small animals. Salt consumption used in water softening is effecting local wastewater systems. Good quality water can also significantly reduce chloride levels in wastewater systems.

Current Water Quality Information (from within the project area)

Recent information from the MN DOH found 23% (35 out of 125) of private wells in Murray County tested between 2008 and 2017 exceeded the Primary Drinking Water Standard for Arsenic. Arsenic causes increased risk of cancer and circulatory problems

Southwest Health and Human Services (SHHS) found that in Murray County 21% (32 out of 151) of private wells exceeded the Primary Drinking Water Standard for Nitrates-Nitrogen. Nitrates causes illness or shortness of breath in infants (Blue Baby Syndrome)

(SHHS) found that in Murray County 38% (73 out of 191) of private wells tested positive for Coliform Bacteria

Coliform Bacteria is an indicator the presence of potentially harmful bacteria such as E Coli or Fecal Coliform

(SHHS) found that in Murray County 60% (65 out of 108) of private wells exceeded the Secondary Drinking Water Regulations for Sulfate

Sulfate gives the water a salty taste and can be a laxative for people not used to the water

Red Rock performed testing on 4 private wells within the project area

- Positive Coliform Bacteria in 2 of 4 sites
- Sulfates exceedances in 3 of 4 sites
- High Total Dissolved Solids in all 4 sites (colored water, staining, salty taste)
- High Hardness

Volume of water is also an issue for some. Hauling water for sanitary use still occurs within the project area. Businesses and homes around Lake Shetek would like good water quality and quantity to meet their daily needs.

Throughout the past 10 years, Red Rock Rural Water System (RRRWS) has been receiving numerous calls for water service from Murray County residents, businesses, Lake Shetek State Park and recently the cities of Avoca and potentially Currie. The estimated number of water hookups is 320. Four years ago, RRRWS took the initiative to find a water source capable of serving this area . After 3 years of research and development, a water source was found and RRRWS has received an approved MN DNR Appropriation Permit. The MN DOH has approved the Wellhead Protection Plan Part 1. Water Sources and Well Head protection is always a first priority for the Red Rock Rural Water System.

Securing a new water source comes at a cost. RRRWS has invested over \$500,000.00 during the development process. Completing the project and building the infrastructure to deliver the water to new members is the next step.

Project Timeline

Water Treatment Plant

Design: July 2020

Bidding: March 2021

Construction: May 2021

Final Completion: May 2022

Elevated Tank

Design: July 2020

Bidding: March 2021
Construction: May 2021
Final Completion: October 2022

Mainline

Design: July 2020
Bidding: January 2021
Construction: April 2021
Final Completion: October 2023

Rural Distribution

Design: July 2021
Bidding: November 2021
Construction: April 2022
Final Completion: October 2023

Other Considerations

Red Rock Rural Water System is a multi-county rural water system formed under MN Statute 116A. The public body is governed by a 9 member Board of Commissioners whom are appointed by the Cottonwood County District Court.

The system began pumping and delivering water in 1985 to 350 original members. Today the system pipes good quality water to 2,500 individual residential/farm/business hookups and 12 cities. The current total estimated population served is nearly 8,500. The Cities of Darfur and Revere will hook up to the system within the next 6-12 months.

Typically, RRRWS applies for funding through USDA Rural Development for its expansion projects. Large projects like this rely on partnerships with other funding sources to make it financially feasible for residents to consider. RRRWS has applied for USDA Loan Funds to make up the Non-State Match. To help make it affordable for the residents, MN Statute 116A allows the system(via district court) to place special assessments on the members taxes. The residents commit \$16,000 per hookup and it is amortized over 30 years to help make it affordable to low and moderate income residents. The collections are made through the respective counties and sent to RRRWS. RRRWS then pays the debt service on the loans.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NA

Who will own the facility?

Red Rock Rural Water System will own, operate and maintain the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Red Rock Rural Water System employs a Manager, Office Manager, Billing Clerk, Accounting Clerk and 7 MN Certified Water Specialists.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The treatment plant and water tower will not be occupied overnight. Daily maintenance will take place for a few hours a day.

Public Purpose

The purpose of Red Rock Rural Water and this project is to bring good quality water to

"Rural Minnesota" at an affordable price.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Dominic Jones
Manager of Red Rock Rural Water System
507-628-4201
dominicrock@centurytel.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

Red Rock Rural Water System

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Lakes Area Regional Expansion Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,850 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$5,650 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,900 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$345 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$90 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$740 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,555 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$170 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,900 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Old West Main Street Reconstruction and Riverfront Pedestrian - Bicycle Bridge connection | 1 | GO | 2,100 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Mississippi Blufflands State Trail – Red Wing Riverfront Trail – He Mni Can-Barn Bluff Regional Park to Colvill Park | 2 | GO | 900 | 0 | 0 | 900 | 0 | 0 |
| Upper Harbor - Bay Point Renewal | 3 | GO | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,900 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,900 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Old West Main Street Reconstruction and Riverfront Pedestrian - Bicycle Bridge connection

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,100 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$2.1 million in State funds are requested for engineering design and construction, including replacement of all underground utilities, of four city blocks of Red Wing’s Old West Main and one city block of Jackson Street and for engineering design and construction of a pedestrian bicycle bridge with a connecting trail completing the accessible route connection to Red Wing’s riverfront over the Canadian Pacific Railway’s main line. |

Project Description

Red Wing’s Old West Main Street neighborhood is a mixed use business district containing retail, restaurants, entertainment, lodging/hospitality and residential dwellings. The roadway reconstruction project will include Full Street and sidewalk reconstruction from 120’ west of TH 61 to Buchanan Street, and Jackson Street from Old West Main to the Canadian Pacific Railway’s right-of-way. The underground utilities (water, sanitary sewer and storm water) are scheduled to be replaced. Some of these utilities are over 135 years old and the city has responded to two major failures to the storm water conveyance system and multiple water main breaks in the past eight years.

The existing roadway section is 78’ wide through the project area. This equates to 21’ wide drive lanes giving vehicle drivers over confidence when traveling through the pedestrian heavy corridor at speeds well over the 30-mph limit. Old West Main has experienced 24 crashes between 2011 and 2015 largely due to high traffic speeds through the excessively wide drive lanes and unsafe backing from parking spaces. Added police enforcement has limited impact.

The project area has inadequate pedestrian facilities. The existing sidewalks and crosswalks are not ADA-compliant. No bicycle facilities leave a void between regional tourism destinations and the city’s popular riverfront, regional and state trails. Reconstruction of the corridor will allow for updated utilities, widening of sidewalks, intersection bump-outs, new street lighting, allow for maximized parking, provide designated bike facilities and assure ADA compliance.

A preferred reconstruction concept has been identified through extensive public engagement over the past year. The City’s Complete Streets Policy construction costs for the project is over \$650,000 and the utility infrastructure replacement cost for the project is approximately \$1.3 million. Red Wing has over \$2.0 million in local funds and \$1.0 million in federal highway administration (FHWA) funding and a \$150,000 DNR Local Trails connection grant obligated for the project.

The project also includes the construction of a pedestrian-bicycle bridge. Red Wing was awarded \$857,000 in federal Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding to design and construct a new ADA compliant pedestrian-bicycle bridge over the Canadian Pacific Railway’s main line. To compliment the bridge, the DNR Local Trails connection grant will provide the connection to the Old West Main Street neighborhood to the riverfront. This will provide residents and visitors of all abilities, an accessible route to the riverfront.

The bridge location, riverfront landing and connecting trail location incorporate the future improvements and upgrades to the Bay Point Park Conservancy, a 201 acre open space and recreational area. The project provides an immediate ADA accessible link to the city's Riverfront Trail system, the Cannon Valley Regional Trail and the Goodhue Pioneer State Trail to, and from, the Old West Main Street reconstruction project area.

The Old West Main Street area is a vibrant mixed use regional commerce center containing retail, restaurants, entertainment, 349 lodging/hospitality rooms and residential housing. There is no existing pedestrian ADA accessible route to and from the city's riverfront parks and trail and the Old West Main Street neighborhood.

The project's total estimate cost: roadway reconstruction, ADA improvements, utility replacement and building the accessible pedestrian-bicycle bridge is \$7.15 million. The total state bonding ask is \$2.1 million with \$4.915 million in funding from other sources.

Project Rationale

As a regional trade center Red Wing's economic development and area businesses rely on reliable utilities, efficient and well maintained transportation systems accessible to persons of all abilities; and, recreational and active living opportunities.

Red Wing's Old West Main and Upper Harbor areas benefit from regional tourism. Our proposed projects will provide a redevelopment catalyst. Rebuilding and enhancing the roadway, pedestrian-bicycling connectivity will increase economic activity and have a high probability of providing a stimulus for more private investment and redevelopment in the area.

Project Timeline

Project Schedule for Development, Design, Engineering and Construction.

- October 2017 - Engineering/Design Consultant Procurement
- Nov 2017 – April 2019 - Public Engagement, Conceptual Plans Developed, Preliminary Engineering and Cost estimates for the Pedestrian-Bicycle Bridge and Old West Main Street Reconstruction Project
- June 2019 - Initiate Final design, update environmental and cultural resources documentation: environmental documentation, final engineering, cost estimating, prepare, submit project plans for MnDOT Review (60%), 90% -100% Plan Review and Approval, MnDOT FHWA Project Memorandum, Permitting, ROW Cert, etc.
- April 2020 - Final Plans and Specifications submitted to MnDOT for review and approval for Bid Authorization of Project
- September 2020 - Bid Letting for Project
- October 2020 - Construction initiation for the Bridge Pedestrian-Bicycle Bridge and Old West main Street reconstruction
- November 2020 - Anticipated Encumbrance of State Bond Funds
- November 2021 - Substantial Project Completion
- June 2022 - Final Project Completion

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will use or occupy the facility?

the public

Public Purpose

The project will have an immediate economic development stimulus impact benefit for Red Wing and the regional economic market area. The project is the rebuilding and enhancement of necessary critical public infrastructure and will provide pedestrians of all abilities safe and accessible routes. The project will be completed on public lands for the benefit of the public and could only be reasonably undertaken by a public entity.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Administrative Business Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1 million in general obligation bonds for this request to fund the pedestrian-bicycle bridge that will provide an accessible connection to Red Wing's riverfront.

(\$ in thousands)

Old West Main Street Reconstruction and Riverfront Pedestrian - Bicycle Bridge connection

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$1,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$499 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,281 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$220 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$499 | \$6,651 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$107 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$199 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$300 | \$863 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$5,681 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$499 | \$6,651 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Mississippi Blufflands State Trail – Red Wing Riverfront Trail – He Mni Can-Barn Bluff Regional Park to Colvill Park

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$900 |
| Priority Ranking: | 2 |
| Project Summary: | \$900,000 in State funds are requested for engineering and construction of the Mississippi Blufflands State Trail, Red Wing Riverfront Trail He Mni Can - Barn Bluff Park to Colvill Park project. The proposed trail will connect a designated regional special purpose park, He Mni Can-Barn Bluff, to Colvill Park. |

Project Description

This request is for \$900,000 in state funding to leverage with \$2.776 million in city and other funding to construct trail segment 3 of the Red Wing Riverfront Trail. The completed trail will provide a riverfront connection to Red Wing’s historic He Mni Can-Barn Bluff Regional Park and the city’s multi-use Colvill Park recreational area.

This trail segment is within the preferred Mississippi Blufflands State Trail corridor and is aligned between the riverbank and TH 61/63 right-of way. When entirely completed, from Red Wing to Lake City, the 17-mile Mississippi Blufflands State Trail will connect regional and state recreational resources, facilities and multiple historic sites along the TH 61 Great River Road Scenic Byway corridor. During the MN DNR master plan planning process, major trail heads were proposed and they included: Red Wing’s Bay Point Park and He Mni Can-Barn Bluff Regional Park, Frontenac State Park and Lake City’s Hok-Si-La Regional Park and Campground.

The MN DNR’s Master Plan for the state trail was completed in 2016. During the MN DNR planning process, MN DNR Parks and Trails determined that the riverfront trail segments within Red Wing were final design and construction ready. It was mutually understood that the City of Red Wing would lead development of the trail and trail facilities for the riverfront trail segments of the preferred state trail corridor (Cannon Valley Trail to Colvill Park) within the city limits of Red Wing due to the extensive preliminary planning and engineering efforts already completed. Red Wing initiated planning and preliminary design for Red Wing’s riverfront section of the trail corridor (the Cannon Valley Trail to Red Wing’s Colvill Park) in 2005.

Red Wing is a regional center and hub of economic activity. One of the key goals of the city is to create a multi-modal transportation network that places a high priority on environmentally sustainable and health conscious modes of transportation. The Mississippi River riverfront is a prime attraction and plays an important role in the region’s tourism and economic development. Connecting regional and state trail systems to Red Wing’s riverfront parks and the City’s historic downtown is a critical step to enhancing economic activity, tourism, and providing active living recreational opportunities for the region.

The total length of Red Wing’s riverfront trail corridor is approximately 2.5 miles. The project, Trail Segment 3, is three quarters of a mile long. The estimated cost for the completion of the trail segment is \$3,676,089.

Support for the project can be evidenced in the \$480,000 federal project planning funding award from the Great River Road Scenic Byway TAP funding pool. Also, the project has been awarded \$550,000 in ENRTF funding from the LCCMR in 2018 and \$250,000 from the DNR Regional Trails Program in 2019. In addition, local and regional philanthropic contributors are readying to support this visionary and regionally significant project. Philanthropic, local and other funding will leverage over \$2.6 million in project funding to build the trail.

Based on engineering and soil boring information, this segment will require above normal rock excavation, added retaining walls and enhanced storm water management systems that add to normal trail building construction costs. The trail corridor abuts an area of the Mississippi River known as Colvill Bay along the TH 61 Great River Road Scenic Byway corridor. The area is known for birding and draws bird watchers from the region.

Red Wing is at the junction of two National Audubon Society listed Important Birding Areas. The area of Colvill Bay on the Mississippi River is populated year round by American Bald Eagles. The trail location is an exceptional location to view many of the 300 species of birds that live and migrate along the Mississippi Flyway.

Project Rationale

This trail segment provides the connection between Red Wing's He Mni Can - Barn Bluff Regional Park and Colvill Park, two highly visible and used regional recreational areas. The project provides a direct connection, separated from roadways and railroad traffic, for disadvantaged neighborhoods to the regional aquatic center in Colvill Park. The project is a critical linking segment of the 17 mile Red Wing to Lake City Mississippi Blufflands State Trail.

Project Timeline

Preliminary engineering and survey has been completed for the project. The project will be fully designed and 'on the shelf'. The project will be ready to solicit bids upon the approval of the 2020 Bonding Bill.

- October 2019 - Conclude fee interest land purchase for trail corridor
- April 2020 - Update existing environmental and cultural resources documentation: environmental documentation, final engineering, cost estimating, prepare, submit project plans to MnDOT for review (60%), 90% -100% Plan Review and Approval, MnDOT Project Memorandum, Permitting, ROW Certificate
- June 2020 - Execute MnDOT LUP, and obtain Bid Authorization
- July 2020 - Construction Start
- December 2020 - Project Substantial Completion Point
- June 2021 - Final Completion of Project.

Other Considerations

Connecting the Goodhue Pioneer State Trail and the Cannon Valley Regional Trail to Red Wing's riverfront, highly utilized riverfront parks and historic downtown will provide a benefit for Minnesota residents and visitors bringing them to the riverfront and joining multiple important regional, recreational facilities.

The riverfront trail project is a critical linking segment for the future development of the 17 mile Mississippi Blufflands State Trail, from Red Wing to Lake City. With a direct connection to the Cannon Valley Trail's 100,000 annual visitors, the Goodhue Pioneer State Trail, He Mni Can - Barn Bluff Regional Park, Colvill Park, Frontenac State Park, and Lake City's Hok-Si-La Regional Park and

Campground.

When fully completed it is probable that the Mississippi Blufflands State Trail will become a top-tier state trail in terms of usage and economic impact.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will use or occupy the facility?

the public

Public Purpose

The project will enhance regional economic activities, economic opportunities, improve public safety, boost public health and augment environmental protections. As a regional trade center, Red Wing's area businesses benefit from the enhanced economic activity and tourism provided by recreational and active living opportunities. The project provides a connection for persons of all abilities to two substantial natural and recreational areas.

Description of Previous Appropriations

M.L. 2015 First Special Session, Chapter 4 - S.F. No. 5, Article 3, Subd. 5. Parks and Trails Management, to the Commissioner of the DNR for the development and completion of the Mississippi Blufflands State Trail Master Plan, Cannon Valley Trail in Red Wing to Lake City, \$50,000 was appropriated

M.L. 2018, Chp. 14, Article 4, Sec. 2, Subd. 9 (d), \$550,000 ENRTF for Capital Costs

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Administrative Business Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$900,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Mississippi Blufflands State Trail – Red Wing Riverfront Trail – He Mni Can-Barn Bluff Regional Park to Colvill Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$268 | \$212 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$67 | \$1,128 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$125 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$176 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$335 | \$3,341 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$140 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$120 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$75 | \$405 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,936 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$335 | \$3,341 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Upper Harbor - Bay Point Renewal

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 3 |
| Project Summary: | \$2.0 million in State funds are needed and requested for pre-design, design, engineering and construction for Red Wing’s Upper Harbor and Bay Point Park Renewal on the Mississippi riverfront. |

Project Description

Several long planned strategic projects that impact Red Wing’s Upper Harbor and Bay Point Park on the riverfront were brought to the forefront within the City’s 2040 Community Plan, adopted in 2019. The city’s riverfront park areas and adjoining neighborhoods are an energetic regional recreational destination, generating economic activity. Red Wing’s new Comprehensive Plan stresses the need to renew, improve, maximize and effectively use public spaces. Priorities for the riverfront area are to rebuild, renew and provide and improve public amenities. Improving and providing connectivity to the riverfront for pedestrians and bicyclists of all abilities remain a goal of the city.

The project plan provides for the reconfiguration of approximately 20 acres of gravel covered former landfill, partially paved areas and the rehabilitation-restoration of wetland areas. Red Wing needs to alleviate parking pressure, redirect grain truck traffic movements and improve grain truck fleeting operations to improve the efficiency of moving locally grown commodities to market. Red Wing Grain, LLC is one of the leading corn and soybean exporters, by river barge, in Minnesota.

For up to two weeks each month during the shipping season, grain semi-trucks Fleet Park on city land that is presently a gravel parking and storage pad. The area is also alternatively used for overflow MN DNR recreational boat launch parking during the fishing season and serves as the city’s overflow summer festival parking area. Realigning Levee Road at the existing round-a-bout will allow the grain truck fleeting to be more efficiently organized, it will be more conducive to the MN DNR boat launch users, and general parking uses.

The reconfiguration of 1,700 feet of Levee Road not only allows truck fleet parking to be more efficiently organized, it will also open eight acres of impermeable gravel and paved surfaces to be used as a public park ‘green space’ event area, with natural grass lawn berm with festival lawn area. Approximately three acres of the land area would be rehabilitated or converted to wetlands. In addition, parking for the heavily used Bay Point Park MN DNR recreational boat launch would be redesigned and increased.

The total project cost estimate is \$4.0 million. The City is requesting \$2.0 million in State Bond funding with \$2.0 million provided from other sources.

Project Rationale

The project is a continuation of the city’s ongoing efforts to revitalize Red Wing’s riverfront. As a regional trade center, Red Wing’s economic activity, area business and industry rely on reliable utilities, efficient and well maintained transportation systems; and, recreational and active living opportunities for persons of all abilities.

Red Wing's Old West Main and Upper Harbor Bay Point Park Renewal area benefit from regional tourism. The renewal of the land areas, enhancing the roadway, providing pedestrian-bicycling connectivity and creating efficient parking stimulate additional use and support healthy lifestyles which adds value to the local economy. Increasing the efficiency and the volume for grain truck fleetings for one of Minnesota's largest grain exporters/shippers by river barge supports Minnesota's Farm economy.

Project Timeline

Tentative Project Schedule:

- Oct. - December 2020 Engineering/Design Consultant Procurement
- January - July 2021 Public Engagement, Conceptual Plans Refined, Preliminary Engineering
- August - December 2021 Environmental Review, Engineering Design Final Plans and Specifications, Bid Documents
- Winter 2021 - 2022 Bid Project
- Spring - Fall 2022 Construction

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The public, for public use and public parking

Public Purpose

The project will have an immediate economic development stimulus impact and benefit for the regional economic and farm market area. The project is the rebuilding and enhancement of public infrastructure.

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Administrative Business Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2 million in general obligation bonds for this project.

(\$ in thousands)

Upper Harbor - Bay Point Renewal

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$520 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$130 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$505 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,345 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Redwood Falls Municipal Airport Runway and Lighting Replacement | 1 | GO | 2,128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Redwood Falls Municipal Airport Runway and Lighting Replacement

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,128

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The project involves the reconstruction of bituminous Runway 12/30, taxi lanes, replacement of the runway lighting system and installation of a storm water management system for future projects outlined on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). The runway lighting system replacement includes edge lights, runway end identifier lights (REILS), and precision approach path indicator lights (PAPIS). See attached project maps.

Project Description

Reconstruction of bituminous Runway 12/30, taxi lanes, replacement of the runway lighting system and installation of a storm water management system for future projects outlined on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP). The runway lighting system replacement includes edge lights, runway end identifier lights (REILS), and precision approach path indicator lights (PAPIS). See attached project maps.

The intent is to leverage \$3,019,723.00 of Federal airport improvement plan (AIP) funding with \$2,128,473.00 in State Bonding funds. The total project cost is estimated at \$5,148,196.00.

The drainage enhancement portion of the project will effectively manage storm water issues that are being experienced the past years due to high intensity/quantity rainfall events exceeding the 1,000 year intervals causing flooding and attraction of waterfowl. Waterfowl and subsequent shore birds present a safety risk to aircraft. This project will prevent bird strikes along with meeting future storm water needs outlined in the Airport Layout Plan(ALP).

Project Rationale

ELIGIBILITY AND JUSTIFICATION:

Runway 12/30 was originally constructed in 1986. The last pavement rehabilitation project was a mill and overlay completed in 2009. The current pavement distresses include longitudinal and transverse cracking, raveling, cupping, alligator cracking, and weathering. The pavement has exceeded its useful life and needs to be reconstructed. Similarly, the runway lighting system has become faulty and should be upgraded. The City is finding it more difficult to find replacement parts for the antiquated system. Reconstructing Runway 12/30 will greatly increase the operational safety of aircraft operating at the airport due to the current pavement distresses. Since the project is reconstruction of existing pavement, an environmental assessment nor categorical exclusion will not be required.

LONG-TERM ECONOMIC SUSTAINABILITY:

The reconstruction of Runway 12/30 would increase operational safety for aircraft currently utilizing the Airport and allow the Airport to attract transient aircraft to the airfield. Increased aviation activity would also increase fuel sales and hangar rentals providing more revenue for the City to operate the airport.

PRIOR TRACK RECORD IN PROJECT DELIVERY AND GRANT ADMINISTRATION:

The City of Redwood Falls has an excellent record of accountability with regard to FAA grants. The City consistently remains compliant with FAA Grant Assurances and promptly completes FAA Grant

Administration tasks.

PROPOSED PROJECT SCHEDULE:

The Runway 12/30 Rehabilitation project will be let for bids in June of 2020 after the State contracts are signed, with construction starting in August 2020. The City of Redwood Falls has requested discretionary or state apportionment funds for reconstruction of Runway 12/30 in Federal FY 2021 (October 1, 2020)

Project Timeline

- June 2019 Preliminary State Bonding Request to MMB
- October 2019 Application for Federal Discretionary funding for Federal FY 2021
- 2020 Session-State Bonding Request presentation to Committee's
- June 2020 secure grant agreement from MNDOT Aeronautics
- June 2020 Bid/Plan development and Solicitation
- August 2020 Bid Award
- August 2020 Construction begins
- November 2020 Construction Paused for frozen conditions
- May 2021 Project Resumes
- November 2021 Final Completion

Other Considerations

Applicant intends to leverage 61% in Federal funding by utilizing 39% of State Bonding dollars to complete the project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Redwood Falls

Who will operate the facility?

City of Redwood Falls

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Redwood Falls for the benefit of its residents and aviation public.

Public Purpose

AIR-SIDE FACILITIES

The air-side facilities include the primary airport infrastructure to accommodate airport operations including the runway, taxiway, and apron facilities. The Redwood Falls Municipal Airport (RWF) was activated as a public facility in 1942. Major airfield improvements were made in 1961, 1962, 1974, 1981, 1996 and 2009.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous funding has been allotted to the project to date.

Project Contact Person

James Doering
507-616-7400
jdoering@ci.redwood-falls.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Redwood Falls Municipal Airport Runway and Lighting Replacement

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,128 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$3,388 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,516 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$808 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$5 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,336 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$367 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,516 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | No |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Rice Lake Sewer and Water Extension | 1 | GO | 2,009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,009 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Rice Lake Sewer and Water Extension

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$2,009**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Rice Lake requests \$2.009 million in state funding to design and construct utilities along the Rice Lake Road business corridor and improve utilities in the area of Howard Gnesen and Martin Road.**Project Description**

The City of Rice Lake's proposed utility improvement project will improve utilities in two locations with the City. The City proposes to construct a municipal lift station just to the north of the intersection of Rice Lake Road and Martin Road as well as complete a water main extension to loop existing water mains from Martin Road to a developer extended water main on Stavenger Road. In addition, the City would propose to extend an existing water main on Martin Road and Howard Gnesen Road to an existing water main at the corner of Howard Gnesen Road and West Calvary Road. This would close a water main loop and sewer utilities would be extended to the west side of Howard Gnesen Road in order to pass undevelopable property, reducing the costs of developing any property in the vicinity.

Project Rationale

This project will extend water and sewer utilities in the area of Rice Lake Road and Martin Road. A developer has brought utilities to the corner and turned them over to the City, however to facilitate future economic growth in the vicinity of this heavily trafficked intersection, utility extensions and a lift station are needed to convey municipal sewer service for existing and future developments. At the same time, the City would extend watermain to close a loop on the west side of town, at this same intersection to Stavenger Road, looping the main. This project would also propose to close a water main loop and extend forcemain at the intersection of Howard Gnesen Road and Martin Road, improving reliable water service for residents in the eastern half of the City and making the sewer available to developable property by extending the mains past undevelopable property.

Project Timeline

The City would proceed with predesign in 2020, with expected construction to be pursued in 2021 or 2022 depending on funding availability. The hope is to perform these two projects in the same project to take advantage of economies of scale.

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

The City does not intend to ask for additional funds for this project aside from this request.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Rice Lake will operate and own the public utility improvements in perpetuity.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Rice Lake will operate and own the public utility improvements in perpetuity.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The City will own and operate the utility improvements but service connections will be made to improve various businesses in the Rice Lake Road corridor as well as to City residents as a whole.

Public Purpose

The City proposes this project with the understanding that access to utility infrastructure is a limiting condition for economic development and expansion in these areas. The substantial cost to construct a municipal lift station and to extend past undevelopable property hampers these two areas from development. This project would remove those barriers, allowing the City to provide utility service and making the cost of developing the property in these areas feasible.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous applications have been made.

Project Contact Person

Toni Blomdahl
Clerk-treasurer
218-249-0733
Tblomdahl@ricelakecitymn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Rice Lake Sewer and Water Extension

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,009 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,009 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$130 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$170 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$209 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,009 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| 77th Street Trunk Highway 77 Underpass | 1 | GO | 7,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 7,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 7,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

77th Street|Trunk Highway 77 Underpass**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$7,000**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The proposed 77th Street underpass of Trunk Highway 77 connects 77th Street east and west of TH 77 (Cedar Ave) to eliminate a critical gap in the Minor Reliever network identified in the I-494 Corridor Solution. The project will construct 0.36 mile of 77th street under (TH) 77 along with bridges for TH 77 and two ramps to/from I-494. The underpass also will provide a sidewalk and the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail.

Project Description

The proposed 77th Street underpass of Trunk Highway 77 connects 77th Street east and west of TH 77 (Cedar Ave) to eliminate a critical gap in the Minor Reliever network identified in the I-494 Corridor Solution. The project will construct 0.36 mile of 77th street under (TH) 77 along with bridges for TH 77 and two ramps to/from I-494. The underpass also will provide a sidewalk and the Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail.

The project includes the following elements:

1. Construct 0.36 mile of a new four-lane divided road connecting 77th street to the realigned Longfellow Avenue on the east side of Trunk Highway (TH) 77
2. Construct new bridge on TH 77 carrying TH 77 over 77th Street
3. Reconstruct the southbound TH 77 to westbound I-494 ramp
4. Reconstruct the westbound I-494 to northbound TH 77 ramp
5. Reconstruct the west TH 77 frontage road over new 77th Street
6. Construct 6 ft wide sidewalk along the south side of 77th Street
7. Construct 10 ft wide multiuse regional trail along north side of 77th Street (links to Nine Mile Creek Regional Trail and the Intercity Regional Trail)

Current funding sources for the project include:

- State Bonding, \$10.0 M
- Federal, \$7.0 M
- Hennepin County, \$1.5 M
- Local Road Improvement Program, \$2.1 M
- City, \$0.6 M
- MnDOT, \$2.3 M

Project Rationale

The project will address regional traffic issues on the I-494 corridor through Richfield and Bloomington. The I494 Corridor Study (1990s) acknowledged that there is a limited ability to expand I-494. The study identified 77th Street as part of an arterial system to carry short to medium length trips in the I-494 corridor. The City of Richfield has since reconstructed 77th Street from I-35W to Cedar Avenue. The project is the last link in the system. The need for a connection across TH 77 has also been identified by Three Rivers Park District as part of the Intercity Regional Trail to provide pedestrian/bicycle connectivity from Richfield to Bloomington. The project will have several benefits, including:

- Keeps short to medium length trips off I-494, freeing up capacity for longer regional trips
- Provides access for existing commercial development and future redevelopment adjacent to I-494, the airport and Mall of America influence area
- Provides secondary access to air freight businesses along Longfellow Avenue
- Provides a connection under TH 77, a major barrier to pedestrian/bicycle travel
- Fills a gap in the sidewalk and trail network
- Improves access to Metro Transit South Bus Garage. Will allow rerouting of bus routes to shorten travel time for transit riders (currently have to access the freeway system either TH 77 or I-494 to get from one side of TH 77 to the other)

Project Timeline

Project Timeline for the following categories:

- Design/Permitting, Fall 2019
- Right of Way, Fall 2019
- Construction, Begin Spring 2021- Complete Fall 2022

Other Considerations

PROJECT HISTORY

Identified as a key connection in the Ring Route as part of the I-494 Corridor solution developed by corridor stakeholders. (1990s)

- All but four counties in Minnesota averaged at least one or more trips per day on this corridor.
- 23% of trips on an average weekday come from Greater Minnesota. This adds up to approximately 34,345 vehicle trips a day from Greater Minnesota.
- Greater than 18% of vehicles along this corridor have a home location more than 100 miles away.
- Construction of 77th Street and American Boulevard (1990s) are critical relievers to the I-494 Corridor
- Funding of the 77th Underpass was reassigned twice to fund the Penn & Lyndale Bridges built to accommodate the future corridor solution.

KEY ELEMENTS

- Provides regional significance as a key connection in the long-term solution for the I-494 Corridor.
- Essential for any access changes along the I-494 Corridor.
- Provides a pedestrian and bicycle connection and establishes a
- regional connection between the SE corner of Richfield (identified as an Area of Concentrated

Poverty) and regional job centers (i.e., MOA/South Loop; International Airport; Freight Centers; Metro Transit South Garage).

- Improves transit options by providing more frequent and
- reliable service on routes 515 and 540 to the Mall of America.
- Ridership: 20,000 boardings/week; 1M/year.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT will own the Trunk Highway system elements.
City of Richfield will own 77th Street within the City limits.
Three Rivers Park District will own the regional trail.

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT will maintain the Trunk Highway system elements.
City of Richfield will maintain 77th Street within the municipal boundary.
Three Rivers Park District will maintain the regional trail.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public, metro transit, and freight traffic.

Public Purpose

Improve the Safety and Mobility of the public transportation network including I-494 which impacts travelers state-wide.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Richfield has received \$2.1M of state bonding funds via LRIP program for design and \$10M in state bonding to go towards right-of-way acquisition and/or construction.

Project Contact Person

Katie Rodriguez
City Manager
612-861-9702
krodriguez@richfieldmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

77th Street|Trunk Highway 77 Underpass

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$9,230 | \$2,870 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$320 | \$280 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$2,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$9,550 | \$20,950 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$7,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$2,100 | \$2,150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$150 | \$18,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$9,550 | \$20,950 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Rochester International Airport (RST) Runway Safety Improvements | 1 | GO | 9,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Silver Lake Dam Modifications and Improvements | 2 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cascade Lake Park Improvements | 3 | GO | 2,750 | 0 | 0 | 2,750 | 0 | 0 |
| Willow Creek Trail Connection Project | 4 | GO | 1,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 18,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,750 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 18,250 | 0 | 0 | 2,750 | 0 | 0 |

Rochester International Airport (RST) Runway Safety Improvements

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$9,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** This project includes the reconstruction of and improvements to secondary Runway 2/20 and associated taxiways, including improved airport approaches. The estimated cost of the total, multi-phased project is \$66.8 million.**Project Description**

The existing runway pavements at the Rochester International Airport (RST) are nearing the end of their useful lives and require reconstruction in the near-term. In order to accommodate the existing users during the critical runway-runway intersection reconstruction, Runway 2/20 will be extended 1,650 feet to the south. This will necessitate approximately 35 acres of land acquisition and a relocation of County Road 30. Parallel Taxiway B will also be reconstructed and improved to meet the needs of the existing users and satisfy current FAA design standards. Additionally, improved approaches to both runways will allow for continued, uninterrupted service.

Project Rationale

RST enplanes the second-largest volume of passengers in Minnesota and is served by the three legacy air carriers. FedEx is RST's major cargo carrier with daily operations at the airport. RST is serviced by Runways 13/31 and 2/20, both of which are nearing the end of their useful life, with reconstruction being the only option. Runway 13/31 serves as the primary runway due to its length and approach capabilities. Runway 2/20 serves an essential, supporting function at RST; however, it is not currently capable of serving as a substitute for Runway 13/31 when that runway is down for construction. Without a second runway with capabilities comparable to Runway 13/31, Mayo Clinic's operation cannot be supported and the world's access to life-saving health care will be severely restricted. The ramifications of a Runway 13/31 closure without an operational substitute during reconstruction are unacceptable from a political, economic, and world-wide healthcare standpoint. The proposed improvements to secondary Runway 2/20 allows RST to continue its critical cargo and commercial aviation operations during the years primary Runway 13/31 will be reconstructed.

Project Timeline

An extensive budget and timeline have been developed for the multi-phased project. Assuming the bonding request is approved by Spring 2020, construction of the first phase can begin in late Summer 2020. Additional design and construction phases would continue until final project completion in 2024.

Other Considerations

Runway 2/20 has been designated a "Secondary Runway" by FAA; a distinction acknowledging the importance of Runway 2/20 to provide continued operation of the airport when the primary Runway 13/31 is unavailable due to construction.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None: The operational costs for the Airport will be provided by the City of Rochester through its normal budget process.

Who will own the facility?

City of Rochester (Airport) and FAA/MnDOT (Navigational Aids)

Who will operate the facility?

City of Rochester (Airport) and FAA/MnDOT (Navigational Aids)

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Commercial airlines, emergency air ambulances, cargo operators, business aircraft and the travelling public including Mayo Clinic patients, doctors and other support staff

Public Purpose

Allows for continued access to the Rochester community and world-class health care by air

Description of Previous Appropriations

No other state bonding funds have been sought nor provided.

Project Contact Person

John C. Reed
Executive Airport Director
507-282-2328
jreed@flyrst.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Rochester International Airport (RST) Runway Safety Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$53,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$67,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$2,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$60,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$67,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | No |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Silver Lake Dam Modifications and Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$5,000**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** Modify the existing Silver Lake Dam to provide a safer grade control, reduce the chance of a catastrophic dam failure, allow fish passage and create recreational opportunities while not changing major flood elevations up or downstream and maintain the normal lake elevation.**Project Description**

Modify the existing Silver Lake Dam to create a more natural cascading grade control structure. This structure will provide safer grade control than the current dam, reduce the chance of a catastrophic dam failure, reconnect the river to the Silver Lake with fish passage and, provide increased recreational opportunities such as kayaking, canoeing and running. The project will not change major flood elevations upstream or downstream and will maintain the normal lake elevation while providing more natural connectivity for aquatic life. The project will include construction of a pedestrian trail along the north side of Silver Lake to connect existing trails from the park to the Broadway Avenue corridor. The trail provides a safer pedestrian crossing of Silver Lake/Zumbro River, with more pedestrian capacity, than the existing sidewalk along the Broadway Ave Bridge.

Project Rationale

To provide environmental improvements to the Zumbro River, improve dam and water safety, and enhance pedestrian safety.

Project Timeline

Start Design Summer/Fall of 2020; Bid Fall of 2020; Construction Winter of 2020 to Summer 2022

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

None: The operational costs for the maintenance will be provided by the City of Rochester with its annual operating budget.

Who will own the facility?

City of Rochester

Who will operate the facility?

City of Rochester

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents, visitors, and guests to the Rochester community

Public Purpose

To provide environmental improvements to the Zumbro River, improve dam and water safety, and enhance pedestrian safety.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Matt Crawford
Project Development Manager
507-328-2411
mcrawford@rochestermn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Silver Lake Dam Modifications and Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$7,650 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Cascade Lake Park Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,750

Priority Ranking: 3

Project Summary: This project includes the development of the backbone infrastructure buildings, art and access for major event activities for the regional population. The estimated cost of the project is \$5,500,000.00.

Project Description

The completion of Cascade lake Park is one of the highest priorities outlined in the Park System Plan adopted in fall of 2016. The proposed project includes an Amphitheater, the Park Pavilion, entrance circle, Art/Sculpture, and play areas that will enhance the improvements the City has already invested in. Cascade Lake is a master planned regional park consisting of over 225 acres created out of the reclamation of sand mining area. The park was first conceptualized in approximately 1969 but was more formally refined in the 1990's and again in the early 2000's. The City is currently operating from the approved 2004 master plan (refined again in 2016) that has had significant public input, DNR input, and user group input along with input from other resourced based groups.

Project Rationale

Cascade Lake Park is the primary focus for park improvements to serve the community as outlined in the Park System Plan. The City has already invested well over \$12,000,000.00 in the park through park acquisition, park shelter, landscaping, beach development, environmental improvements, trail development and connectivity to the community. The explosive growth of the community is putting strains on funding, but yet expectations for having adequate high quality park spaces remain very high. This demand is also generated by the regional aspect of the community and visiting population. The State has already acknowledged the regional importance of this park through its designation as a **PARK OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE**. The varied components of the Park will make this park a destination onto itself. Already with the connection to the trail network this regional park is already seeing estimated visitor use in and around the park of over 100,000 users annually. Because the proximity to the downtown area and Mayo Clinic it is anticipated that many visitors will utilize the adjoining trails and the park for some relaxation and outdoor enjoyment. Providing this facility will enhance the lives of both visitors and residents alike.

Project Timeline

The consultants for the project have developed an extensive budget based on the cost of the various park improvements. Assuming the bonding is approved by May of 2020, the design for the project improvements would be completed in the 4th quarter of 2020 with an anticipated award of bids occurring 1st quarter of 2021. Construction would commence in the 2nd quarter of 2021 and full completion would occur by the fall of 2022.

Other Considerations

This Park has been identified by the State as a "Park of Regional Significance" by the Greater MN Parks and Trails Commission.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None: The operational costs for the Park will be provided by the City of Rochester through its normal budget process.

Who will own the facility?

City of Rochester

Who will operate the facility?

City of Rochester

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents, visitors, and guests to the Rochester community

Public Purpose

Development of Parkland for the benefit of all residents, visitors, and guests.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There was not a specific phasing plan for the various projects, and there have been many. However, this will be the 4th project in a short 5 year period.

Project Contact Person

Michael J. Nigbur
Parks and Forestry Division Head
507-328-2541
mnigbur@rochestermn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.75 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Cascade Lake Park Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,125 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,320 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$55 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Willow Creek Trail Connection Project**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,500**Priority Ranking:** 4**Project Summary:** This project extends the City's trail network from approximately HWY 63/28th Street SE, proceeding under Trunk Highway 52, and to County Road 101/45th Street SE to the Gamehaven Regional Park. The project includes property acquisition, predesign, design and construction with a total estimated cost of \$3,000,000.00.**Project Description**

The extension of the Willow Creek Trail meets not only key priorities outlined in the Park System Plan, it also meets goal of the Bicycle Master Plan, and connectivity goals of the Comprehensive Plan. There are several routes available for this project depending on availability of land rights. Depending on the final route of the trail the proposed project includes property/easement acquisition, ½ mile of trail rehabilitation, creek crossings, approximately 2.5 miles of trail construction, installation of trail amenities like wayfinding & rest areas, and a trail head located at the Gamehaven Regional Park. This project has been anticipated and had various planning options since the late 1990's.

Project Rationale

Securing safe access to Gamehaven Regional Park and to segments of the City that are currently cut off due to Highway 52 is a key goal to meet for the community. Highway 52 effectively isolates Willow Creek neighborhoods from other neighborhoods and the existing trail network in the City. This same isolation impacts the 460 acre Gamehaven Regional Park (State designated as a **PARK OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE**) and the 260 acre Boy Scout Reservation Camp. Gamehaven Park is a regional facility that will provide facilities for snow tubing, mountain biking, hiking, cross country skiing and sledding, with an expected total development costs of \$14 Million dollars. This park is in the early stages of development as an Active Natural Park. Connecting this park to the trail networks will further enhance the regional benefits of both the trail and park.

The proposed project would create a crossing under US 52 that would provide a connection between the path and trail network in Willow Creek to the larger city network of trails. Additionally this trail connection would serve as a first leg to connect to the Bluestem Trail linking to Stewartville, MN.

Project Timeline

City staff have been anticipating this project since the late 1990's. This includes various feasibility analysis and preliminary project concepts. Assuming the bonding is approved by May of 2020, and based on the completion of a project that is currently under construction, the design for the project improvements would be completed in the 1st quarter of 2021 to allow negotiations with property owners through the 2021. Anticipated award of bids occurring the 1st quarter of 2022 with construction commencing the spring of 2022. Construction completion is anticipated to be the summer of 2023.

Other Considerations

Gamehaven Park has been identified by the State as a "Park of Regional Significance" by the Greater MN Parks and Trails Commission.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None: The operational costs for the trail will be provided by the City of Rochester through its normal budget process.

Who will own the facility?

City of Rochester

Who will operate the facility?

City of Rochester

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents, visitors, and guests to the Rochester community

Public Purpose

Development of public trail for the benefit of all residents, visitors, and guests.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Michael J. Nigbur
Parks and Forestry Division Head
507-328-2541
mnigbur@rochestermn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Willow Creek Trail Connection Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$610 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,890 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Rocori Trail Phase 3 | 1 | GO | 1,370 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,370 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,370 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 0 | 0 |

Rocori Trail Phase 3

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$1,370 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$1.37 million in state funds is requested to design and construct phase 3 of the Rocori Trail to be located in Stearns County, between the cities of Cold Spring and Rockville. |

Project Description

Phase 3 of the Rocori Trail will be constructed on the BNSF railroad corridor along Trunk Highway 23. This phase completes the connection of the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring, and Rockville.

The ROCORI Trail is connected to the Glacial Lakes State Trail, which is a trail of statewide significance that runs from Willmar to Richmond. This Phase 3 will bring that connection from Willmar to Rockville, approximately 50 miles of trail. Stearns County has future plans to connect to the ROCORI Trail at Rockville and travel east into the St. Cloud area. Connections could then easily be made to both the Lake Wobegon and Beaver Island Trails. Furthermore, Stearns County has talked about connecting the Beaver Island Trail to Warner Lake Park. The City of Clearwater in Wright County has plans to connect its trail to Warner Lake Park. This would bring more than 100 miles of trail connectivity to the region.

Project Rationale

It is important to complete the Rocori Trail with Phase 3. Federal, state and local dollars have been invested with Phases 1 and 2; we need to complete the vision and the investment that has already been made. Rocori Trail:

- Connects three cities and two townships (11,407 people) and all of the cross town travel, including the school district (2,000+ students).
- Cold Spring Granite, a large Cold Spring business, utilizes the trail for their employee wellness program. GNP is another large employer in the area and they wish they had direct access to the trail, and they would with Phase 3.
- Will draw visitors from outside the region as this trail connects to the Glacial Lakes State Trail.
- Also provides access to great natural resources and recreational opportunities – Eagle Park and Rockville County Park, to name just two great resources.

Project Timeline

Design Engineering is completed
 Environmental Complete by December 2020
 Award bids April 2021
 Construction begin May 2021
 Construction completed by December 2022

Other Considerations

The ROCORI Trail Construction Board has been working since 2004 to connect the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring, and Rockville. To date, we have:

- Built Phase 1 – 178th Ave, Richmond to 2nd Avenue NE, Cold Spring.
- Acquired all of the necessary ROW from BNSF to construct Phases 2 and 3.
- Is in process of constructing Phase 2, which was recently bid and will be constructed this year from Mill Street in Rockville west towards Cold Spring, ending at the 235th Street cul-de-sac.

The cities created a Joint Powers Board, the Rocori Trail Construction Board (RTCB), to apply for and administer funds and oversee construction. The RTCB is comprised of six voting representatives, two officials from each City, and staffed by three city staff representatives. The RTCB's enabling legislation, passed by each City's council, allows them to apply for grants and enter into contracts for work.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Trail board will be responsible for all annual operation and maintenance cost

Who will own the facility?

RTCB

Who will operate the facility?

RTCB

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public

Public Purpose

Public Trail - an off-road trail facility for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized forms of transportation - which provides the following benefits:

- Recreational opportunities
- Economic development
- Tourism
- Health and Wellness
- Intrinsic

Description of Previous Appropriations

- \$372,000 received in 2008
- \$800,000 received in 2010

Project Contact Person

Martin
Bode
320-251-5836
mbode@rockvillecity.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.37 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Rocori Trail Phase 3

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,370 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$812 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$365 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,547 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,297 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,547 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Rogers I-94 Pedestrian Overpass | 1 | GO | 2,200 | 0 | 0 | 2,200 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 2,200 | 0 | 0 | 2,200 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 2,200 | 0 | 0 | 2,200 | 0 | 0 |

Rogers I-94 Pedestrian Overpass

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$2,200

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$2.2 million in state funds (\$4.4 million total project) is requested to acquire property, design and construct a new, safe pedestrian overpass over I-94 in Rogers. I-94 divided Rogers and has created a separation in residential, school, park and employment access. There are no separated crossings in the Rogers area and that has created risk issues for pedestrians and cyclists to cross I-94.

Project Description

The project includes a pedestrian crossing over I-94, touching down south of the railroad tracks on the west/south side of I-94, and at 137th Street on the east/north. The new bridge will be approximately 1000-ft in length and will be 17'-4" above both I-94 and Industrial Blvd, and 25-ft above the railroad tracks and will implement ramps on both sides of the bridge to accommodate ADA requirements. The project also includes the construction of a bituminous trail on the north side of the interstate to connect the touch down location to the existing City of Rogers trail system. The project total costs are estimated at \$4.4 million

Project Rationale

A new, dedicated pedestrian overpass is needed to achieve an acceptable level of safety and mobility for pedestrians, bicyclist and area children with regard to crossing Interstate 94 in Rogers.

The City of Rogers bears much of the burden of regional roadway infrastructure, with Interstate 94, State Trunk Highway 101, CSAH 81 all intersecting to divide the City of less than 13,000 population, greatly hindering local traffic and safe pedestrian flow. In recent years the City has invested millions of dollars in vehicle traffic improvements on State and County highways, but pedestrian safety and access across I-94 remains a significant concern.

The east-west segment of I-94 in Rogers extends more than 5 miles from border to border. Only one pedestrian crossing current exists along that entire corridor, and that crossing is at the extremely busy interchange/confluence of I-94, TH101 and CSAH 81, a harrowing location for walkers and bicyclists, especially area children who need to cross to reach school, recreational and social opportunities.

Due to the unsafe and unnerving nature of the existing I-94/TH101 overpass, area youth have taken to crossing under the Interstate via a large storm water culvert. This is extremely dangerous and is signed as prohibited, but it underscores the desperate need to provide a safe and efficient alternative to the current crossing.

The solution to this mobility and safety concern is the construction of a new, dedicated pedestrian overpass approximately one mile west of the current I-94/TH101 freeway interchange.

Project Timeline

Should funding be made available in June 2020, the following scheduled would be expected for completion:

Preliminary Design - December 2020
Environmental Documents - February 2021
Final Design - September 2020 through February 2021
Construction - June 2021 through November 2021

Other Considerations

I-94 bisects the community within the City of Rogers with currently only a single crossing that connects the north and south portions. The current crossing at TH 101 is a high-volume roadway with safety concerns at the entrance and exit ramps. Rogers has developed school facilities, park systems and residential housing on both sides of the interstate leaving the bike and pedestrian community underserved. Children are currently crossing through a storm sewer underpass at I-94 near the location for the proposed pedestrian bridge. A separated crossing over the interstate is necessary to reconnect the community.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The State would own the facility with the City providing routine maintenance. The maintenance cost is expected to be approximately \$1,000/year. The bridge will have a 75-100 year lifespan.

Who will own the facility?

The pedestrian bridge would be owned by MnDOT and maintained by the City.

Who will operate the facility?

City of Rogers

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Open for non-motorized public use by pedestrians, bicyclists, etc.

Public Purpose

The project meets the ultimate public purpose in creating an acceptable level of safety for pedestrian travelers by creating an alternate Interstate crossing. The new crossing allows pedestrians/bicyclists to avoid the existing heavily travelled TH101 crossing, thereby reducing pedestrian/vehicle conflicts at busy on/off ramps.

The new crossing would be a major step in reconnecting a city whose population centers, jobs, schools and parks have been divided north to south by a road network designed to serve the region and the country automobile traffic with little care for local impacts.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Steve Stahmer
City Administrator
763-229-5511

sstahmer@rogersmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.2 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Rogers I-94 Pedestrian Overpass

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$30 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$30 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL | 1 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 |

Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$5,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$5 million in state funds is requested to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip the renovation of the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL in Roseville. This project includes the building, building systems and facilities.

Project Description

This project is to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip the renovation of the 110,000 sq. ft. Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL and its support areas.

The following is a specific project and cost list based on a professional Condition Assessment Report and the City Capital Improvement Program

1. Refrigeration Plant - Current condenser (evaporation tower) is original to system, has outlived its useful life and is in need of replacement

| | |
|---|------------|
| Compressors | \$ 140,000 |
| Chiller | \$ 830,000 |
| Condenser and Pumps | \$ 340,000 |
| Treatment/Ammonia Detection, Electrical Systems | \$ 250,000 |

2. Brine Pumping Systems - Current Systems are original and are in need of replacement

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Brine Replacement and Filtration | \$ 60,000 |
| Pumps | \$ 100,000 |
| Expansion Tanks | \$ 32,000 |

3. Concrete Refrigeration Rink - Expansion joints are being undermined and are in need of repair and upgrade to current technology

| | |
|---|------------|
| Repair Expansion Joints | \$ 200,000 |
| New Insulated Grade Beams with Expansion Joints | \$ 525,000 |

4. Perimeter Paving and Underground Drainage System - Warm up and training track is in need of renovation

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Mill and Blacktop Perimeter (training track) of OVAL | \$ 90,000 |
| Improve Drainage Systems to Prevent Undermining of Slab | \$ 142,000 |
| 5. Safety Pad and Fence System - Replace safety pad and fence surrounding the OVAL to meet world competition standards | \$ 450,000 |
| 6. Renovate Banquet Facility and Rooftops - Replace carpet, divider door and rooftop units | \$ 205,000 |
| 7. Lobby/Mechanical Room and Banquet Center Roof Replacement | \$ 245,000 |
| 8. Bathroom Remodel - To improve condition and access to upper level bathrooms from the OVAL to accommodate major events/large crowds | \$ 95,000 |
| Subtotal before Contingency and Soft Costs | \$ 3,704,000 |
| Contingency and Soft costs (35%) | <u>\$ 1,296,400</u> |
| TOTAL WITH CONTINGENCY AND SOFT COSTS | \$ 5,000,400 |

Project Rationale

The Guidant John Rose MN OVAL (Minnesota OVAL) opened in December 1993 with primary funding by the State of Minnesota. The facility is aging at 25 years old and significant capital improvements are necessary in the next few years. The funding is necessary to make much needed health, safety, and facility improvements to maintain the structural integrity of the Minnesota OVAL. The total capital and design investment needed for the Minnesota OVAL is \$5,000,400 as described above.

The Minnesota OVAL:

- Serves the entire state - the majority of users are from outside of the City of Roseville
- Is a training venue for amateur and professional athletes
- Frequently hosts national and international competitions, each drawing hundreds of international athletes and visitors to the state
- Provides a family-friendly venue for residents to experience winter outdoor recreation

This world class facility has established itself as one of Minnesota's most visible venues for regional, national and international events. The OVAL is home to numerous affiliate user groups including local hockey organizations, Greater MN Speedskating, Midway Speedskating, USA and MN Bandy. 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/ice.

Because of the metropolitan, regional, state significance of the Minnesota OVAL, the city has received financial assistance from the State of Minnesota on a number of occasions for expansion of facilities and general capital improvement needs specifically in 1998, 2006 and 2008.

This funding is critical for the Minnesota OVAL to continue to provide these benefits to the State of Minnesota. This money will pay for capital improvements in areas and components ending their useful life.

The city has been responsible for the operating costs and deficits but has relied on the State of Minnesota for capital costs.

Project Timeline

As identified in the attached Condition Assessment Report, it is very important that this project begin as soon as funds are available.

Because of the uniqueness of this facility and it being the only one around the area, it is relied upon heavily to be operational especially during the winter season for a large number of Metropolitan, State, Regional, National and International events.

This proposed renovation project intends to avoid major disruptions during the ice season therefore requiring the work to be completed during the off ice seasons. Equipment replacement would be ongoing through 2021/22.

Following is the anticipated timeline from start to finish:

- Project begins approximately 6/1/20 – finalize underground drainage and renovation plans and begin equipment procurement process
- Substantial completion 12/31/2021
- Final completion 12/31/22

Other Considerations

This project is critical, as the MN OVAL is 25 plus years old with many components outliving their useful life. In the spring of 2019, a leak was detected in the brine pumping system. While the leak was localized and repairable, it is indicative of the general age and condition of the components. Equipment breakdowns and failures will continue to occur at an accelerating rate if this project is not approved. When a failure occurs because of the massive size and uniqueness of the Minnesota OVAL; they are complex, expensive, and time consuming to repair requiring unplanned shutdowns.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Not applicable. The City of Roseville will continue to own and operate the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Roseville will continue to own and operate the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Roseville will continue to own and operate the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL serves the entire State of Minnesota with the majority of

users from outside the City of Roseville. It provides a training venue for amateur and professional athletes, frequently hosts national and international competitions, draws hundreds of international athletes and visitors to the state for each event and provides a safe environment for families from throughout the state.

Public Purpose

The Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL provides a safe environment for families and individuals from throughout the state to experience winter outdoor recreation, including training and competition for amateur and professional athletes. The facility brings visitors to the region and State of Minnesota and has an overall economic impact to the State of Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

1991/92 - \$1,900,000 appropriation for the design and construction of the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

1998 - \$500,000 appropriation to construct banquet/meeting room and locker room facilities at the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

2006 - \$500,000 appropriation to add restrooms and to improve efficiency and safety of the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

2008 - \$600,000 appropriation for multiple improvements and enhancements to the Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

Project Contact Person

Patrick Trudgeon
City Manager
651-792-7021
pat.trudgeon@cityofroseville.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Guidant John Rose Minnesota OVAL

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$555 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,445 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Gateway State Trail Extention | 1 | GO | 1,250 | 2,250 | 1,100 | 1,250 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,250 | 2,250 | 1,100 | 1,250 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,250 | 2,250 | 1,100 | 1,250 | 0 | 0 |

Gateway State Trail Extension

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$1,250 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$4.6 million in 2020-24 is requested to complete design, construction and furnishing of the Gateway Trail from a terminus within William O’Brien State Park around the Interpretive Center/campground complex to the Scandia Village Center, and for further design and land acquisition for the Gateway Trail extension south of William O’Brien and north of Scandia. |

Project Description

The work will be completed in multiple phases (request is based on design work completed in 2017-18); all land assembly for the William O’Brien to Scandia segment is complete:

Final engineering, design and tunnel construction under Washington County road 52, Oakhill Rd N . - \$ 1,000,000

Final engineering and design from Oakhill Rd N to a terminus within the park determined by Minnesota Department of Natural Resources-Parks and Trails Division (MNDNR PAT). - \$ 250,000

Construction of the trail from the Scandia Village Center to William O’Brien State Park’s northern boundary—Approximately 2 miles; design for this segment is partially complete. - \$ 1,000,000

Construction of the trail from the northern border of William O’Brien State Park to a terminus within the park determined by MNDNR PATR—2 miles - \$ 2,000,000

Land acquisition and preliminary engineering from Pine Point Park to William O’Brien - \$ 250,000

Preliminary exploration, feasibility assessment, and conceptual engineering for the route of the Gateway Trail north of Scandia toward Chisago County and the Swedish Immigrant Regional Trail - \$ 100,000

Total Requested. \$4,600,000

Project Rationale

In 2017 the state completed acquisition of the final linkage for connecting the Gateway State Trail from Marine on St. Croix, through William O’Brien State Park to Scandia. Recently, the legislature removed an Agricultural Preserve restriction to allow the final link of the Gateway between William O’Brien and Scandia to be developed now. Predesign work on a portion of the trail was completed in 2018 using previously appropriated funds. This project is now ready to move ahead with the final design and construction.

This project will result in the extension of the state’s most popular bike trail the additional 3 miles from the William O’Brien State Park to the Scandia Village Center. There is an existing paved trail in the

Highway 95 road right-of-way from the Park to Marine on St. Croix. This will allow access from the Park to two tot-lots, tennis courts, a skating rink, multiple sports fields, restaurants and other commercial facilities and the Gammelgarden Museum in Scandia, and complete a trail segment anticipated to have very heavy use by families and children. This segment will also make possible on-road linkage to points south to Pine Point Park and points north to the Swedish Immigrant Trail in Chisago County. Design and engineering work for the north and south linkages is also proposed to be funded to accelerate completion of the linkage to the Immigrant Trail and Interstate Park and ultimately links to the Munger Trails to connect to Duluth.

While Scandia is a highly popular on-road bicycling destination, there is strong community and state need for the off-road trails funded in this request to provide greater appeal and safety for families and children that use the State Park and for the Scandia elementary school population.

Project Timeline

2020 – 2021: Final engineering, design and tunnel construction under Washington County road 52, Oakhill Rd N.

2021-2022: Final engineering and design from Oakhill Rd N to a terminus within the park determined by Minnesota Department of Natural Resources-Parks and Trails Division (MNDNR PAT).

2021-2023: Construction of the trail from the Scandia Village Center to William O'Brien State Park's northern boundary—Approximately 2 miles; design for this segment is partially complete.

2023-2024: Construction of the trail from the northern border of William O'Brien State Park to a terminus within the park determined by MNDNR PATR—2 miles

2020 – 2024: Land acquisition and preliminary engineering from Pine Point Park to William O'Brien and Preliminary exploration, feasibility assessment, and conceptual engineering for the route of the Gateway Trail north of Scandia toward Chisago County and the Swedish Immigrant Regional Trail.

Other Considerations

Scandia will cooperate with the DNR, Washington County, Chisago County, the cities of Marine on St. Croix and Lindstrom and May Township in the various aspects of the design and engineering to assure coordination and connection. Multiple local planning and community groups will also be engaged, including Friends of Scandia Parks and Trails, Cycling Scandia, the Gateway Trail Association, the Scandia Heritage Alliance and Gammelgarden Museum.

Scandia is currently one of the most popular on-road biking communities in the state due to its 30.6 miles of arterial roadways with full shoulders, it's beautiful terrain, and its relatively low traffic density. Washington County in its 2010 Comprehensive Plan identified three routes as critical on-road connections for cycling: Highway 97, County 15 (Manning Avenue) and County 3 (Olinda Trail). All have full width shoulders. The County has supported this trail extension as bringing the State trail to a location that accesses these three on-road routes and completing a connection with high use. These on-road connections link Scandia to multiple county and state parks and other trails including William O'Brien State Park, Big Marine Park Reserve, and the Hardwood Creek State Trail and the Swedish Immigrant Regional Trail.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

It is not expected these segments will materially increase state operating costs because the State Park and Trail are already in existence and the State Park has staff and resources to manage and maintain the new portions proposed.

Who will own the facility?

The DNR will own the trails via easements across private property and on already owned public land within the State Park.

Who will operate the facility?

This is a State Trail and will be operated by the DNR.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The trails are open and accessible to all of the public for hiking, bicycling and horse riding.

Public Purpose

Assuring a proper design is critical to advancement of the Trail, as is providing connections to existing and proposed trails to provide the public with a well-designed and thoughtful system for enjoying the state via walking, bicycling and horse riding. Moving forward with design and construction of the Gateway Trail through this section of Scandia is a highly desirable addition to recreational use of the State Park and will advance multiple longer term trail connection goals in the region and toward the goal of an off road connection to Duluth from the Metro area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Multiple, including recent allocations for design and engineering within William O'Brien, for final engineering between the Park and Scandia Village Center, for purchase of the easements connecting the Park to the Scandia Village Center, and for easements between Pine Point Park and William O'Brien, as well as multiple prior appropriations for the construction Gateway and Browns Creek Trails. This appropriation would maximize the value of prior expenditures.

Project Contact Person

Christine Maefsky
Mayor
651-433-2684
c.maefsky@ci.scandia.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.25 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Gateway State Trail Extention

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,250 | \$2,250 | \$1,100 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,250 | \$2,250 | \$1,100 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$68 | \$122 | \$60 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$27 | \$49 | \$24 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$81 | \$147 | \$72 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$14 | \$24 | \$12 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,060 | \$1,908 | \$932 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,250 | \$2,250 | \$1,100 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Open Library Project at Savage Library | 1 | GF | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Merriam Junction Trail | 2 | GO | 9,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| County Highway 42 Expansion | 4 | GO | 5,625 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway (TH) 13 and Dakota and Yosemite Interchange - Local Road Improvements | 5 | GO | 5,269 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| US Highway 169, TH 282, and CH 9 Interchange - Local Road Improvements | 6 | GO | 9,277 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 29,230 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 29,171 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Open Library Project at Savage Library

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$59 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$59,000 in state funds is requested to install new service desks and a security curtain in the Savage public library. This work will prepare the space for implementation of an “open library” model, which offers residents unstaffed access to library facilities and resources. |

Project Description

Open Libraries—also known as "self-serve libraries"—leverage self-service technology to provide unstaffed access to library facilities as a supplement to staffed open hours. By integrating existing library systems (customer database) with building security systems (door access control), Open Library technology allows public libraries to offer residents access to library buildings and resources when staff are not present. Residents who opt-in to the service would use their library cards as keys to the library before and after staffed open hours. Residents would insert their library card into a reader at the entrance, enter a pin, and gain access to library buildings and resources. Essentially, this is applying the SnapFitness model to public libraries. As an example, the typical weekday staffed open hours at the Savage Library are 10:00 am to 8:00 pm. Open Library technology would allow residents to access the space without staff mediation from 6:00 am to 10:00 am and 8:00 pm to 10:00 pm, or whatever hours are determined to be appropriate.

This request would reconfigure the existing Savage Library space to secure staff areas and resources to make open library implementation feasible. The total cost of this project is estimated to be \$110,000. The requested state funds will be used to replace two service desks and to install a security grille to surround the front desk. Local and additional state funds made available to public libraries through the Department of Education will be used to retrofit 12 doors with card reader access, install an alarm system, and install CCTV.

Project Rationale

Open Library implementation will benefit County residents seeking expanded access to public library buildings and resources. Many of the activities residents need access for (browsing, picking up requested items, using computers, printing) do not require staff to be present. This solution is an efficient way to provide that access.

Project Timeline

University of Minnesota Resilient Communities Project feasibility study: January 2019 -May 2019
 Library reconfiguration: October 2020
 Project complete & service launch: November 2020

Other Considerations

In Scott County, library service is provided collaboratively: cities own and maintain the buildings and the County provides the service. Both parties support this project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

The City of Savage will continue to own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The facility will continue to be operated collaboratively. The City will maintain the facility, and the County will deliver library programs and services.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Savage Library is a public library and will be used by the general public.

Public Purpose

The project makes public resources—in this case, a library building and resources—more easily accessible to residents.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Jacob Grussing
Scott County Library Director
952-496-8641
JGrussing@scottlib.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Open Library Project at Savage Library

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$59 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$58 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$117 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$110 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$7 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$117 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Merriam Junction Trail

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$9,000

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: \$9 million in state funds is requested to construct 2.2 miles of trail on the former Union Pacific Rail line connecting Scott and Carver Counties, the National Wildlife Refuge Louisville Swamp Unit, the City of Carver, and the regional trail network in Carver County.

Project Description

The Merriam Junction Regional Trail is a planned destination regional trail along an abandoned rail corridor now owned by Scott County. The trail will include 2.2 miles of multi-use trail as well as a new pedestrian bridge at the location of a former rail bridge crossing over the Minnesota River. In addition, one replacement of a rail bridge (collapsed) and the retrofitting of two existing rail bridges for pedestrian use. The project will be funded with local dollars to support the remaining cost of the project.

Project Rationale

The trail connection will connect two regional trails and complete a segment of tier 2 regional bike transportation network. This project will connect Carver and Scott Counties – two counties that have limited locations for bike and pedestrian to cross the Minnesota River, a significant barrier. The trail and river crossing were master planned in 2011 in partnership between the two counties. Much of the trail corridor was acquired from the railroad in 2012. At this time the need for the river crossing was recognized as an essential component of the two agencies trail’s connecting and will open up opportunities for active transportation and recreation for residents of both counties. In addition, the project will draw a regional audience as it traverses and connects with the National Wildlife Refuge and the historical community of Carver.

Project Timeline

2020– Engineering and Environmental Documentation

2021-2022 – Construction

Spring 2023 – The trail opens for use

Other Considerations

The Merriam Junction Trail project is located in an area above the regional average for race or poverty. In Louisville Township, 11.1 percent of the population is nonwhite with 8.9 percent Hispanic or Latino (2010 U.S. Census). Approximately 15.2 percent of the population is below the poverty level according to the Poverty Status for Individuals computation from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5- Year Estimate. Additionally, 9.6 percent of the population is over the age of 65.

The project will include a pedestrian crossing of the Minnesota River from the City of Carver to the US

Fish and Wildlife Service Louisville Swamp Recreation Area. This pedestrian crossing of the Minnesota River is safer for bicyclists and pedestrians compared to the existing crossings located on the shoulder of roadways of CSAH 9 in Jordan to the South or TH 41 in Jackson Township to the North. The Merriam Junction Trail river crossing provides a travel time savings as CSAH 9 and TH 41 crossings are 2 and 4 miles from the proposed trail crossing.

This is an area that is underserved by regional recreation facilities. In recent outreach with the community, it was found that residents in county districts 1&3, the districts closest to the proposed project, feel they are underserved with trails and regional park facilities.

Several local agencies have expressed support and interest in the project including:

- City of Carver
- US Department of Interior
- Carver County
- Three Rivers Park District

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Scott County

Who will operate the facility?

Scott County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

This regional trail segment is envisioned to accommodate a wide-range of user groups with varying abilities and offers access to many populations. With relatively flat grades established from the previous use as a railroad corridor, there is ample opportunity for trail visitors of all abilities to use the trail. The project will provide paved ADA access from the City of Carver to the US Fish and Wildlife Service Louisville Swamp Recreation Area which does not exist today, benefiting people with disabilities and elderly with access to something that they did not have access to before. Research into use of regional facilities found that only 3% of users had ADA needs - this is lower than the proportion of people in the metro area that claim a disability. More facilities that provide ADA access to this and the surrounding State and Federal wildlife area are needed to connect all people to the outdoors. This also provides a healthy alternative to using a vehicle to crossing the Minnesota River. Ensuring that recreational opportunities are affordable and accessible (by various modes of transportation) to all citizens is an existing Scott County initiative. As such, there will be no fee charged for use of the trail by either Scott or Carver County.

Public Purpose

The regional trail development will provide recreational and transportation opportunity for residents in the area as well as a regional draw bringing people to the Minnesota River, a natural resource with limited access opportunities in the metro area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Patricia Freeman
General Manager, Scott County Parks and Trails
952-496-8752
PFreeman@co.scott.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Merriam Junction Trail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$9,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$579 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$567 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$491 | \$5,838 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$125 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$38 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,762 | \$14,876 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$1,007 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$19 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$108 | \$1,157 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$24 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$604 | \$12,062 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$1,607 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,762 | \$14,876 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

County Highway 42 Expansion

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$5,625 |
| Priority Ranking: | 4 |
| Project Summary: | \$5,625,000 in state funds is requested for construction in local road improvements to support a planned expansion CH 42 from CH 17 to CH 83 in the cities of Shakopee, MN and Prior Lake, MN. |

Project Description

Scott County is proposing road improvements along a 1.4 mile-section of County Highway (CH) 42 from CH 17 (Marschall Road) to CH 83. The improvements include reconstructing the existing two-lane undivided rural highway and expanding it to a four-lane divided highway with multi-use trails on both sides of the roadway, stormwater ponds, turn lanes, and expanded shoulders.

The total project cost is estimated at \$14,953,000 including construction for local components. The requested local cost for construction is estimated at \$5,625,000.

Project Rationale

The purpose of the project is to improve multimodal mobility and provide additional capacity along CH 42. CH 42 is the principal arterial connection between the easterly limits of Dakota County and CH 17, and the proposed project will close the last remaining gap in the four-lane arterial system, benefitting both commuters and local traffic.

Project Timeline

Construction: 2020

Other Considerations

The project is adjacent to the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community (SMSC). CH 42 provides access to the SMSC residential and commercial properties.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There are no additional state operating dollars that will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

CH 42 will be owned by Scott County.

Who will operate the facility?

CH 42 will be operated by Scott County.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Purpose

CH 42 serves as the major transportation and economic corridor between Dakota and Scott Counties. The projected traffic volumes for the corridor are anticipated to be over capacity in the future. The expansion will eliminate congestion and enhance the businesses along the corridor.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Lisa Freese
Transportation Services Director
952-493-8363
lfreese@co.scott.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

County Highway 42 Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,625 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$4,020 | \$5,308 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$4,020 | \$10,933 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$3,728 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$292 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,116 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$817 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$4,020 | \$10,933 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highway (TH) 13 and Dakota and Yosemite Interchange - Local Road Improvements

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$5,269 |
| Priority Ranking: | 5 |
| Project Summary: | \$5,269,000 million in state funds is requested to design and construct of local road improvements to support a programmed interchange at the intersection of Trunk Highway 13 and Dakota Avenue in Savage, MN. |

Project Description

The proposed TH 13 and Dakota Port Access and Mobility Project includes the construction of a grade separation, frontage roads, and accompanying access ramps at the intersection of Minnesota State Trunk Highway 13 and Dakota Avenue (referred to as TH 13/Dakota Avenue). TH 13/Dakota Avenue is currently an at-grade un-signalized intersection. The project will provide a supporting road network that removes direct access to TH 13 and offers alternate routes and safer access to TH 13 for truck traffic generated from the adjacent Ports of Savage and industrial uses. The supporting road network and the underpass connecting Dakota Avenue will facilitate movement across TH 13 and allow for right-in-right-out access through the use of access ramps on to TH 13 at Yosemite Avenue.

The total project cost is \$31,202,000 including construction and design on both the local and Trunk Highway components. The associated local costs for design and construction of local road improvements and bike/pedestrian accommodations is estimated at \$5,269,000.

Project Rationale

TH 13 serves a key freight connection between agricultural rich lands in southwestern Minnesota to the Ports of Savage. The Ports of Savage, consisting of five separate private ports off the Minnesota River and two rail corridors served by three railroad companies, serves as an intermodal hub for the shipment of grain and other commodities beyond Minnesota. Approximately two million tons of material is shipped through the Ports of Savage annually from major operators including Cargill, CHS Inc., Bunge, and Superior Minerals. Ninety percent of the grain arrives at the ports by truck via TH 13. Increased efficiency in the flow of commercial truck traffic will enhance freight mobility along the TH 13 Corridor.

Project Timeline

Design: 2020

Right-of-Way acquisition: 2021-2022

Construction: 09/01/2022-10/31/2024

Other Considerations

Safety: The project will help reduce crashes for turning vehicles. TH 13 is a high volume corridor for commuter related traffic. Improvements in mobility and removal of high volume, peak hour, left turn movements will allow all employees to have a safer and faster more predictable commute. The project

corridor is surrounded by manufacturing, industrial, and seasonal jobs that employ several levels of income ranges. The proposed project will ensure these employees can access TH 13 with reduced safety and accesses issues.

Transit: The project area is within MVTA's 492 and 495 transit service routes. Both of these routes are express connections from the Burnsville Cedar Grove Transit Station and either downtown Minneapolis or the Mall of America. Increased vehicle mobility will allow improved speed for these routes.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There are no additional state operating dollars that will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota Avenue and Yosemite Avenue will be owned by the City of Savage. MnDOT will be responsible for construction associated with the Trunk Highway improvements.

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota Avenue and Yosemite Avenue will be operated by the City of Savage. MnDOT will operate for the construction associated with the Trunk Highway improvements.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

N/A

Public Purpose

TH 13 serves as the main transportation and economic lifeline between Savage and its Ports through the connections of local roads, Southwestern Minnesota through 169 and Minneapolis through 35W.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Lisa Freese
Transportation Services Director
952-496-8363
lfreese@co.scott.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highway (TH) 13 and Dakota and Yosemite Interchange - Local Road Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,269 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,269 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$666 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$111 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,701 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$791 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$8,269 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

US Highway 169, TH 282, and CH 9 Interchange - Local Road Improvements

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$9,277 |
| Priority Ranking: | 6 |
| Project Summary: | \$9,277,000 in state funds is requested to acquire land, design, construct local road improvements to support a planned interchange at the intersection of United States (US) Highway 169 and Scott County Road 9 in the City of Jordan, MN. |

Project Description

The proposed project is to reconstruct local roads that support an interchange at the intersection of US 169, Scott CR 9, TH 282 and local roads. Project components include grade separation of CR 9 and Union Pacific Railway, intersection improvements at CR 9 and local roads Valley View Drive and 190th Street West, Triangle Lane local road improvements and access modification.

The total project cost is \$38,000,000 including construction, right-of-way, and design on both the local and Trunk Highway components. The associated local costs for right-of-way, design, and construction of local road improvements is estimated at \$9,277,000.

Project Rationale

The City of Jordan has been working with Scott County and MnDOT for over 20 years to develop proposed solutions for the TH 169/TH 282/CR 9 intersection area. Improvements are needed to address safety and operational concerns in the area, and the challenges are complex. CR 9 provides critical access across the Minnesota River into Carver County.

Reconstruction of the TH 282/ US 169 intersection will remove the last existing traffic signal on US 169 in Scott County. Removing the existing traffic signal and direct access to correct existing safety and congestion issues and eliminate the freight bottleneck along the US 169 corridor. Construction of an interchange will improve safety and reduce delays on the corridor by removing the at grade signalized intersection that becomes congested.

Project Timeline

Final Design: 2020

Right-of-way acquisition: 2021-2022

Construction: 2022-2023

Other Considerations

Safety:

Historical crash data were obtained for the previous five (5) year period (2011 – 2015) using MnDOT’s Crash Mapping Analysis Tool (MnCMAT). A review of the crash data showed that there was a total of 100 crashes at study intersections. Of the 100 crashes, there were 2 fatalities, 0 incapacitating injuries, 4 non- incapacitating injuries, 19 possible injuries, and 75 property damage only crashes.

Freight Mobility:

US 169 serves a key freight connection between agricultural rich land in southwestern Minnesota to the Twin Cities, including the Ports of Savage. Ninety percent of the grain arrives by truck to the Ports of Savage, a nationally prominent port for the shipment of grain and other commodities to the rest of the world. Three million tons of material is shipped through the Ports of Savage, which is six percent of all inland grain traffic originating in the United States.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There are no additional state operating dollars that will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

CR 9 will be owned by Scott County and the Triangle Lane, 190th Street West and Valley View Road will be owned by the City of Jordan. MnDOT will be responsible for new ramps and bridges associated with the interchange construction and Trunk Highway improvements.

Who will operate the facility?

CR 9 will be operated by Scott County and the Triangle Lane, 190th Street West and Valley View Road will be operated by the City of Jordan. MnDOT will operate the new ramps and bridges associated with the interchange construction and Trunk Highway improvements.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Purpose

US 169 serves as the main transportation and economic lifeline between Mankato and Southwestern Minnesota to the Twin Cities and Ports of Savage. CR 9 is a major river crossing of the Minnesota River that connects Scott County to Carver County. The current at grade signalized intersection on a high-speed expressway is a safety concern and bottleneck to the regional traffic and commerce that travels through the intersection. The local roads improvements will provide access to existing and future businesses and residents around the interchange area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Lisa Freese
Transportation Services Director
952-496-8363
lfreese@co.scott.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

US Highway 169, TH 282, and CH 9 Interchange - Local Road Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>State Funds Requested</i> | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$9,277 | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Funds Already Committed</i> | | | | |
| County Funds | \$665 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Pending Contributions</i> | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$8,668 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$665 | \$17,945 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$650 | \$1,020 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$15 | \$30 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$11,440 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,455 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$665 | \$17,945 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | No |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| US 169 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpass | 1 | GO | 2,162 | 0 | 0 | 2,162 | 0 | 0 |
| Scott County Innovation Center | 2 | GO | 60 | 4,113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cultural Corridor with Minnesota Riverbank Stabilization and Access - Shakopee | 3 | GO | 11,753 | 0 | 0 | 11,753 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 13,975 | 4,113 | 0 | 13,915 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 13,975 | 4,113 | 0 | 13,915 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

US 169 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpass**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$2,162**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The proposed US 169 pedestrian and bicycle overpass will provide a vital trail connection for regionally significant trail corridors within Shakopee and a direct connection to a Tier 1 Regional Bicycle Trail Network (RBTN). This new section of trail and pedestrian bridge is a Tier 2 RBTN Corridor and will eliminate a significant gap for pedestrians and bicyclists. In addition, the overpass will connect tens of thousand of residents to Valley Green Industrial Park, a major employment center.

Project Description

The US 169 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpass project consists of a 7-span (750 foot) pedestrian and bicycle bridge over US 169. In addition, the project includes approximately 1,350 feet of trail to integrate the bridge to the existing trail system. The trail segment would run 150 feet south of US 169 and tie into an existing trail within city owned open space in the Southbridge neighborhood. 1,200 feet of new trail north of US 169 would be constructed to connect to the Quarry Lake Park trail and park entrance. The project also would connect to an off-street trail along Innovation Boulevard which connects to the Minnesota State Trail, Valley Fair Theme Park and the wider Minnesota River Recreation area. All components of this project will be built to ADA standards, including the bridge ramp grades and trail widths. The project has written approval from MnDOT for construction within and over their right-of-way along US 169. This letter is attached as an exhibit.

The total project cost is estimated to be \$3,680,000, which includes the bridge and the adjoining trails (to integrate the bridge into the existing trial network). The project costs would be split between construction, engineering and easement acquisition. Construction is projected to cost \$2,870,000, and easement acquisition, engineering and administrative costs are estimated to be \$810,000.

The City of Shakopee has regarded this project as a much needed one for many years, and the city has requested other sources of grant money in the past. However, the project has not received grant funding to date. The city does have this project in its 2020-2024 Capital Improvement Plan as a tier 1 priority project and has identified local funding sources which will satisfy the local funding match of at least 50% of the project cost. These sources are as follows; up to \$1,840,000 total city match with \$920,000 coming from the Park Reserve Fund and \$920,000 coming from the Capital Improvement Fund. The remaining \$1,840,000 would come from this bonding request. These local funds are scheduled to be available in 2022 but could be available sooner, once the bonding match has been secured.

The project has been identified as a priority by multiple city documents and plans, including the 2030 and 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the Capitol Improvement Plan and the forthcoming Parks and Trails Master Plan. As the city continues to build out its off-street trail network, this project will become an even higher priority. Additionally, the project will satisfy a regional purpose and serve as a key step to complete the Prior Lake Outlet Channel Regional Bicycle Trail Network Search Corridor; this corridor

has been included by the Metropolitan Council in their 2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan as a Tier 2 Regional Bicycle and Trail Network Search Corridor. It will connect to the Minnesota River Valley State Trail, a Tier 1 RBTN Alignment, and Scott County to communities north and east in the region.

Project Rationale

US Highway 169, a fully grade separated and limited access freeway, presents a major barrier for Shakopee residents who wish to travel by foot or on bicycle north and south of the highway. This barrier especially affects the eastern half of Shakopee, where the nearest pedestrian crossing of US 169 is at Canterbury Road, a County State Aid Highway, which has a full interchange with US 169. It presents safety and access issues for pedestrians or cyclists utilizing the route and is over one and half miles to the west from the project location. Additionally, Stagecoach Road is the only grade separated crossing of US 169 in the eastern portion of the city. Currently, this road does not have any dedicated pedestrian or bicycle facilities and crosses a very active railroad line at-grade. This project will connect the north and south trail system within Shakopee at a needed location and provide a safe crossing of US 169 for pedestrians and cyclists. As the city continues to develop south and north of US 169, safe connections across the freeway are needed to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle transportation to and from recreational, residential, commercial, institutional and industrial areas.

Construction of the trail segment and overpass will eliminate the last gap between residential and retail areas south of US 169 and employment and recreational destinations north of US 169, including; the Valley Green Business Park, Valley Fair Amusement Park and the Minnesota River recreational amenities. The project will enhance local and regional trail connectivity, remove a large local and regional barrier and trail gap, and provide a grade separated crossing between high-speed vehicle traffic and pedestrians/bicyclists. The project will improve access for users to several major employers and thousands of nearby residents; there are over 5,000 people living and 7,000 people working within a mile of the project location and thousands more living and/or working further north, south and west.

As mentioned above, this project will satisfy many regional trail considerations and be a key asset for not only the city but also the region as a whole. Shakopee, home to the Valley Fair theme park, Canterbury Downs horse track and card room and adjacent to Mystic Lake hotel and casino, is a major tourist destination for state and regional visitors. Better connecting the pedestrian and bicycle network within Shakopee would help the community better serve the visitors coming into Shakopee. By providing more travel options for local residents and visitors will also help improve their health and well being and a safer and more accessible pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to a fast-growing community. By completing a key link in the regional bicycle and trail network, Shakopee will be further integrated with the region as a whole.

Project Timeline

Predesign: September 2020

Engineering: February 2021

Design: February 2021

Construction: May 2022 – December 2022

This project has been within the city's CIP for some time and is continually being delayed due to insufficient funding. This project is a high priority project for the City of Shakopee. If funded, the project will come to fruition.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There will be no impact on state operating subsidies. The City of Shakopee will be responsible for

future maintenance.

Who will own the facility?

City of Shakopee

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Shakopee would be responsible for future maintenance of the structure.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General Public, both cyclists and pedestrians, will be able to use the facility. The facility will be fully ADA compliant and accessible to everyone in the general public who would wish to use it.

Public Purpose

The public purpose of this project will be to provide a safe and convenient trail access for city residents and the wider general public who travels by foot or bicycle, whether for transportation or recreational purposes.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous state appropriations exist. The city has previously applied for grant opportunities for this project, but as of the time of this application, the city has not been awarded any funding.

Project Contact Person

Joe Widing
Long Range Planner
952-233-9325
jwiding@shakopeemn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.162 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

US 169 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpass

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,162 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,163 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,325 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$240 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$270 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,870 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$645 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,325 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Scott County Innovation Center

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$60**Priority Ranking:** 2

Project Summary: The Scott County Innovation Center project, located in Shakopee, creates a state-of-the-art facility for job training, post-secondary education (in cooperation with Minnesota State University Mankato) and research and development space, mainly for students and interns working on future automation and manufacturing for the State of Minnesota.

Project Description

Scott County has no post-secondary education facility. Residents and businesses must attend facilities in either Mankato, Bloomington or Minneapolis. Scott County businesses need specialized training facilities. Manufacturing in the region is rapidly automating, and for this reason, highly specialized training for both workers and design engineers are necessary. The Innovation Center will provide a platform for Minnesota State University Mankato to assist Scott County and Minnesota in becoming a premier innovator in manufacturing.

Project Rationale

The innovation center would improve the local economy by creating jobs and increasing tax revenue. The region has a civilian labor force of 79,364 with a participation rate of 76.6%. Scott County businesses offers employment for over 48,000 employees; however, when compared to the Twin Cities region, Scott County's average annual wages are nearly 24% lower than the Twin Cities region. The largest number of jobs offered in Scott County are in the arts, entertainment, recreation and accommodation and food service sectors.

Scott county residents, however, are primarily employed in the manufacturing, health care, social assistance, retail trade, professional scientific and technical assistance sectors. As a result, approximately 60% of Scott County's workforce commutes out of the county for employment. Providing training programs for existing businesses to expand jobs locally will assist in retaining a qualified local labor force and increase the average wages offered to local employees. Of individuals ages 25 to 64 in Scott County, 41.1% have a bachelor's degree or higher which compares with 31.8% in the nation. 30 colleges and seven universities with 54 campuses exist in the MN State College and State University (MNSCU) system. None of these are in Scott County. High school students seeking post-secondary education programs and individuals seeking to enter or continue in trade school, a 4-year or master's program must go outside of Scott County for their education. A community and employer survey was conducted, and the results show a need and desire for post-secondary education within Scott County (384 respondents ages 16-24). 60% of High School Students noted they would consider a local post-secondary education option, if it were available.

The Innovation Center will help create and retain jobs. According to the Minnesota Secretary of State's Office, 1081 new business filings occurred in Scott County in 2018. According to the US Department of Labor, the five-year survival rate for new businesses, without assistance, is 48%. Given mentorship and training opportunities, such as those proposed in the Innovation Center, the success

rate increases to 87%.

The state's goal to advance innovation and enhance manufacturing capacities will be addressed with business training facilities within the Innovation Center. It is projected that providing existing businesses with access to equipment, training and post-secondary education programs and encouraging collaboration between the academic and private sectors will stimulate innovation and productivity.

Lastly, Scott County currently does not have any post-secondary educational facilities. The Innovation Center is proposed to include classrooms for post-secondary students as well as training rooms for businesses to utilize for specialized workforce development programs. Scott County employers have indicated local programs with welding certification, leadership training, computer skills, bi-lingual and translation skills, etc. is needed and greatly lends to their success.

Project Timeline

Predesign: September 2020

Design: February 2021

Construction: May 2022 – May 2023

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There would be no impact on state operating subsidies. The City of Shakopee will be responsible for future maintenance.

Who will own the facility?

City of Shakopee

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Shakopee

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General Public, local businesses, Minnesota State University Mankato

Public Purpose

One public purpose of this project is to advance the state's goal of innovation and enhance manufacturing capacities with business training facilities within the Innovation Center. Another purpose is to provide existing businesses with access to equipment, training and post-secondary education programs. The last purpose is encouraging collaboration between the academic and private sectors to stimulate innovation and productivity.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Michael Kerski

Director of Planning & Development

952-233-9346

mkerski@shakopeemn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Scott County Innovation Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$60 | \$4,113 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$61 | \$4,113 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$121 | \$8,226 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$21 | \$1,426 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$121 | \$8,226 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Cultural Corridor with Minnesota Riverbank Stabilization and Access - Shakopee**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$11,753**Priority Ranking:** 3**Project Summary:** The Cultural Corridor with Minnesota Riverbank Stabilization and Access Project in Shakopee will protect critical public infrastructure while providing the public access to the Minnesota River. Building this project will result in one of the first Cultural Corridor experiences in Minnesota.**Project Description**

The proposed Cultural Corridor will create a regional/statewide cultural destination which will allow residents and visitors to experience the Minnesota River as it once was – the gateway to Scott County, Shakopee and the original site of the Native American people in the area. The corridor is a partnership between the City of Shakopee, Scott County and Three Rivers Park District.

The corridor plan includes: creating a gateway into the corridor by restoring the rights-of-way along Highway 101 to a mixture of grassland, woodland and unique savanna species (except at intersections and turning safety zones); restoring the Minnesota River bank including removal of invasive species and installation of erosion control devices; opening the grounds of Three Rivers: The Landing to public access (similar to Colonial Williamsburg), while providing a more protected alternate to the State Trail; restoring Memorial Park to a more natural area to protect the existing burial grounds and removing all activities around the burial sites; providing common corridor signage in parks and along trails; renovating the original Shakopee Brickyard and owner's residence into park uses including a kayak and canoe launch from the historic marina; renovation of Huber Park into a regional attraction which includes public art, access to the river, a conflict memorial and access to the historic Highway 101 Bridge (Holmes Street Bridge) which was restored by MNDOT.

The project begins at the western edge of Downtown Shakopee and ends at the eastern most point at Three Rivers District - The Landing. The project includes riverbank stabilization and protection in the downtown area and naturalization of the public rights-of-way in the eastern most area.

Riverbank stabilization

In recent years, the Minnesota River throughout the state has experienced substantial and prolonged flood stages, exposing the riverbank to more erosion and stability issues. Within Shakopee, the riverbanks are located adjacent to critical infrastructure as well as substantial parks and recreation facilities. While the city's surface water indeed flows to the Minnesota River, the prolonged flooding and other experienced issues are most notably due to outstate flooding from much of the land which is not regulated as stringently as the land within Shakopee under the Clean Water Act initiatives, restrictions and mitigation requirements. The city has no options other than taking measures to protect the city's infrastructure and facilities which are being threatened by the state's waters.

Also, it is notable the Minnesota River has had substantial and extended issues from these outstate floodwaters over the past few years. Most notably is this spring when the city experienced high flood

stages beginning in March and continued over three months. Only recently are there signs of the river finally starting to recede.

A portion of the city's infrastructure is located immediately adjacent to and within the steep slopes of the Minnesota River's riverbank. This includes 3,000-ft of 18-in trunk sanitary sewer line. This line is a critical trunk sewer line that provides sewer service to a substantial portion of the community. This line is an original Metropolitan Council Interceptor line which was subsequently inherited by the City of Shakopee as part of a mutual turn over agreement, and hence, the city inherited all of the issues which come with the line. It is imperative the riverbank is better stabilized to properly and permanently safeguard the city's infrastructure from erosion as a result of the river flood waters.

Flooding also presents problems in other areas of the riverbank. Flooding inundates Huber Park in the downtown which is used for public entertainment and play and various city recreational events. This flooding blocks access to the State Trail and other trails along the river.

The project will install concrete steps and barriers along the steep bluff which will protect the sewer line from erosion. In Huber Park, a number of stone and concrete walls will be constructed which will buffer flood waters while also removing invasive species and trees along the riverbank that have accelerate the erosion.

Huber Park

The State of Minnesota restored and gave to the community the original 101 bridge which has now been converted to a pedestrian-only facility. The improvements to Huber Park will include two new points of access to the bridge. This is one of the only spots where the public can access views over the Minnesota River in the area. The new access points include a pedestrian crossing on 101/First Avenue and a new modern stair tower attached to the historic bridge. Other improvements include constructing an art plaza on the high point of the riverbank which does not flood and in Huber Park, a conflict memorial which will commemorate all wars fought by the region's residents including Native Americans.

Further in Huber Park, new flood breaks will allow people access the riverfront. The city will also be installing a new playground which will be reflective of the history of the area and will be a regional attraction.

Marina

The historic marina and the original Shakopee Brickyard will become a public access point to the river, and the brick yard will become a historic site that can be used for wedding and events. Three Rivers Park District will run a boat rental kiosk which will allow rental of kayaks and canoes that can be taken out at either two or three miles downriver. The brickyard house is the finest surviving example of Shakopee brick and served originally as the brick manufacturer's residence.

Memorial Park

Memorial Park, Shakopee's oldest, will be enhanced with the removal of an existing playground, shelter and paths. Most of the area will be restored to an oak savannah state. The corner adjacent to the founding springs will be where public activity is concentrated including nature play, non-ground-penetrating tables and signage.

The Landing

This recreation of early settler life will be enhanced with a new parking lot and modified to allow public access through the city similar to Colonial Williamsburg. Two exit points will be created to allow canoes and kayaks to leave the river. The historic mill on the river will be further restored to create a

river gateway into the park.

Entrance into the city

Along Highway 101, median and other rights-of-way, will be landscaped with natural prairie grasses in areas that do not impact sight lines. Heritage Oak trees will be preserved, and new oak species planted outside of crash zones.

Corridor Branding

Throughout the corridor area, including at the entrance, signage will notify the public they are entering a unique cultural area which represents Native American culture through European settlement.

Project Rationale

This Cultural Corridor is one of the largest areas in the state which represents the nature that attracted the original inhabitants. The Minnesota River served as a "highway" for commerce for goods and people. The river basin is one of the largest wildlife areas in an urbanized setting. The river has negative impacts on the city's infrastructure but is also the number one area the public would like to access.

Shakopee has been a river town from its very founding. The original Native American settlers located along this corridor because of the springs which provided fresh water and allowed them access to hunting, fishing and crop growing in the fertile flood areas. Today, many of these areas remain, including a large burial mound area. This area, coupled with The Landing's early settlement buildings tells a story of the region and the state; this project will allow current and future generations access to the Minnesota River while also immersing them in the history of the region and the State.

Project Timeline

Engineering: September 2020

Design: February 2021

Construction: May 2022 thru December 2024

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Shakopee

Who will operate the facility?

City of Shakopee will be responsible for maintenance.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public

Public Purpose

The public purposes of this project is to educate the public about the cultural heritage of the region and the state. It will also provide safe and convenient trail and river access for residents and visitors while protecting critical city infrastructure.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous state appropriations beyond the MNDOT's restoration of the historic 101 highway bridge's conversion to pedestrian.

Project Contact Person

Steve Lillehaug
City Engineer/Public Works Director
952-233-9361
slillehaug@ShakopeeMN.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$11.753 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Cultural Corridor with Minnesota Riverbank Stabilization and Access - Shakopee

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$11,753 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$11,753 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$23,506 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$17,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$3,506 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$23,506 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Shell Rock River Watershed District

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Fountain Lake Restoration Phase 2 | 1 | GO | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 7,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Fountain Lake Restoration Phase 2

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$7,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$7.5 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, construct an earthen berm for sediment, and implement continued restoration activities for Fountain Lake in the City of Albert Lea by the Shell Rock River Watershed District.

Project Description

This request is for \$7,500,000 in state funding for continued, and completion of, restoration strategies of Fountain Lake in the City of Albert Lea, Freeborn County.

The funds will be used to execute an option agreement to purchase up to 50 acres of additional land to build Cell 4 of a Confined Disposal Facility (CDF). A CDF is an engineered structure for the containment of sediment. The confined berm walls enclose the disposal materials from adjacent waters. Once the land is purchased, the funds will be used to design, permit, and build CDF Cell 4. CDF Cell 4 will hold approximately 500,000 cubic yards of sediment.

Funds will also be used to complete permitting and other requirements necessary to remove approximately 500,000 cubic yards of sediment from Fountain Lake’s Main Bay and Bancroft Bay.

The estimated project cost is \$7.5 million. The Shell Rock River Watershed District (SRRWD), through Albert Lea’s local option sales tax, will continue to contribute to project costs. Costs include project engineering and design, construction (restoration activities), construction administration, and acquisition of land for sediment dewatering and/or disposal.

Project Rationale

The Shell Rock River Watershed District is in the middle of a multi-year effort to restore Fountain Lake and meet state water quality goals. Currently the District has been funded to build Cells 1, 2 and 3 of the CDF and to remove 1,171,000 cubic yards of sediment as part of the lake restoration strategies. To fully achieve the goals of restoring Fountain Lake, additional resources are now needed to complete the remaining scope of the project, Phase 2.

The project was originally planned and estimates in 2006 called for sediment removal of 1 million cubic yards. Once final engineering and modeling was completed in 2016 it was determined the biggest impact to reduce internal phosphorus load was closer to 1.7 million cubic yards. Additionally, early cost estimates of \$5 per cubic yard grew to \$7-8 per cubic yard. The District added built-in best management practices to increase the longevity of the project and engineered sediment basins at all major outlets. Without additional funding the project will fall short of achieving the goals needed for the Lake to be removed from the state’s impaired waters list.

The Fountain Lake Restoration project is well-underway. Funding in 2020 will allow the district to enjoy efficiencies by moving seamlessly into Phase 2. Any funding delays will contribute to increased costs. A successful project will improve water quality, increase habitat success and redefine recreational opportunities for Fountain Lake.

Project Timeline

The District will purchase the ground for CDF Cell 4 by December of 2020. Engineering and design for CDF Cell 4 will start in January of 2021, with construction during the 2021 construction season. Permitting and restoration preparation will coincide during the 2021 CDF Cell 4 construction. The restoration contract will be placed out for bid and approved by December of 2021 for sediment removal to take place during the 2022 and 2023 summer seasons.

Other Considerations

Albert Lea’s Local Option Sales Tax, supported by our citizens, has been and continues to be a great tool to assist funding of the Fountain Lake Restoration Project and continues to provide an important local contribution to support the State’s contribution to this project of significance.

The District has been committed to increasing the water quality of Fountain Lake since its inception in 2003 at the request of local citizens. Our purpose is to conserve and restore water resources of the District for the beneficial use of current and future generations. This includes clean water, enhanced fish and wildlife habitat, and recreational opportunities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

N/A– No facility is proposed

Who will operate the facility?

N/A– No facility is proposed

Who will use or occupy the facility?

N/A– No facility is proposed

Public Purpose

Fountain Lake is critical to the City of Albert Lea’s economic future, tourism industry and identity. The lake is a popular summertime destination for activities.

Fountain Lake has a tributary watershed which consists primarily of agricultural land. Runoff from the watershed includes sediment and pollutants such as phosphorous, which are conveyed to the lake through streams, ditches, and storm sewer pipes. Historically, deposits of sediment and phosphorus in the Lake have hampered the water quality and adjacent fish and wildlife habitat. Now on the States Impaired Waters List, the SRRWD is committed to restoring Fountain Lake, helping to achieve the fishable, drinkable, and swimmable water initiatives.

In addition to stabilizing upstream creeks, repairing failing septic systems, and managing rough fish populations in upstream lakes, the SRRWD and partners have actively promoted agricultural practices that support conservation efforts.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Previously the District was appropriated \$7.5 million, which the District matched \$11.2 million funds for the acquisition, engineering and building of Cells 1, 2 and 3 of the CDF site and to remove 1,171,000 cubic yards of sediment.

Project Contact Person

Andy Henschel
District Administrator
507-377-5785
andy.Henschel@co.freeborn.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Fountain Lake Restoration Phase 2

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$450 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$550 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Multimodal Trailhead Center | 1 | GO | 1,900 | 0 | 0 | 1,900 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,900 | 0 | 0 | 1,900 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,900 | 0 | 0 | 1,900 | 0 | 0 |

Multimodal Trailhead Center**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,900**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: \$1.9 million is requested to build a Multi-Modal Trailhead Center in Silver Bay, MN that provides ample lighted parking; separate, safe and accessible access to non-motorized and motorized trails; a multi-use building with lavatories and showers; picnic areas and playground; greenspace; and all conveniently located to city and business amenities. The funds will be used for design, engineering, construction, and furnishing/equipping the multi-use facility to be opened May 2022.

Project Description

The project consists of engineering and constructing a \$3.8 million multi-modal trailhead center that would include the redevelopment of a dilapidated area of the community into a recreational trailhead center and wayside rest. The purpose is to provide safe and separate trail access for both non-motorized and motorized traffic all in one location. The facility would be open to the public, be handicap accessible, and also include the following: lavatory and shower facilities, ample parking for cars/trucks and trailers (169 sites); outdoor gathering plaza, playground, and picnic areas; open green spaces for recreational fun or primitive overnight stay; convenient location to local businesses and other community recreational amenities.

The funding request of \$1.9 million will be used for design, engineering, bidding, vetting of bids, award of bids, construction management, and reporting/closeout management, to be conducted by Bolton & Menk, Inc., who were chosen through a competitive bid process. The construction will include site preparation, site utilities, site amenities (curb, gutters, trails, playgrounds, landscaping, lighting, bituminous, sidewalks, trail connections, picnic areas, and signage), Construction of the Trailhead building and picnic shelters, landscaping, and other miscellaneous items (tables, chairs, benches, signage). The Contractor will be chosen through a competitive bid process. All engineering and construction will meet required funding requirements, building code requirements, environmental code requirements.

The proposed Multi-Modal Center would be located along two scenic byways, the Superior National Forest Scenic Byway and the North Shore Scenic Byway, as Silver Bay is the connecting point of both Byways. People visiting will have direct access to the State-owned Gitchi-Gami Bike Trail, the Superior Hiking Trail, the CJ Ramstad Snowmobile/ATV trail, and other local trails. It will also have access to Black Beach Park on Lake Superior, Scenic Overlooks, tennis courts, and safe walking on city sidewalks. It will also complement the new Black Beach Municipal Campground being constructed in summer 2019. Although there are other primitive parking areas and small wayside rests along the North Shore, there is no center that is all encompassing and providing the level of amenities for tourism as Silver Bay's proposed Multi-Modal Trailhead Center.

All of the property is currently owned by the City of Silver Bay and is located at 109 Outer Drive, Silver Bay, and legally described as Parcel A and Parcel B registered as is evidenced by Certificate of Title

Nos. 13824 and 13399, so there is no need for any land acquisition. The property is also properly zoned as Recreational. The City has completed a topographic survey and conceptual planning. In closing, there are over 30 miles complete of the proposed 89-mile Gitchi-Gami bike trail, more than 150+ miles of the CJ Ramstad ATV/Snowmobile trail, 310+ miles of the Superior Hiking Trail, and plenty more miles of local ATV, snowmobile, and biking trails completed and/or proposed which can all be safely accessed from the proposed location.

Project Rationale

SAFETY: Currently, those looking to access the trails in Silver Bay are required to park along the roadways because there is not ample parking to accommodate the amount of traffic the city receives from trail users, and the issue is getting worse due to the increase in visitor traffic to the community. There is a small parking lot on the Northwest side of the City that overflows on to the highway by people accessing the hiking and the ATV/Snowmobile trails. This forces people to get out of their vehicles, walk along, and remove motorized equipment directly on to the highway. It also causes bottleneaking in this area and is simply unsafe for people trying to access the best trails on the North Shore of Lake Superior. The proposed trailhead will remove those safety issues, make it more convenient to amenities and businesses within our community, promote healthy living, and enhance economic development opportunities.

REDEVELOPMENT OF A DILAPIDATED AREA: Silver Bay is located in one of the Opportunity Zone Census Tracts. The property is a very underutilized area within the community. It was once an active outdoor hockey and skating rink with a dilapidated building that was constructed in the 1950s as a warming house, arts and crafts center, & a place for youth gatherings. Today, the outdoor rink has been moved to a location next to the arena in order for it to be better maintained. The Rec Building is vacant and will be removed by the city prior to constructing the Trailhead Center, The new facility would be multi-purpose. The upper level would host a large meeting space, handicap accessible bathrooms, kitchen area, office, and storage area. The upper level would be rented for use by the public but would be available for use for larger public events such as bike races, running/walking races, etc. as there would be ample parking in the area. The lower level of the facility would host 24-hour access to handicap accessible lavatories and shower areas for the public as a wayside rest, something that is not available at other rest stops in the area. The City offers 24-hour police coverage to protect the area.

DRAW TOURISM AND ECONOMIC IMPACT: Silver Bay is the connection point between the North Shore Scenic Byway and the Superior National Forest Scenic Byway. The community is centrally located with only an hour drive time from Duluth, Grand Marais, and the Iron Range. It is centered between four State Parks – Gooseberry, Split Rock, Tettegouche, and Temperance – and is the middle of some of the best motorized and non-motorized trails in Minnesota.

In 2014-2015 the Council of Silver Bay took a serious look at the development of their communities Comprehensive and Capital Plan. Silver Bay is primarily known for its taconite industry, but we are also known for our trail system and forest. Unfortunately, Silver Bay has never fully capitalized on the large amount of tourism that passes along the North Shore. A key issue is that Silver Bay is the only community along the North Shore where Highway 61 does not pass directly through the community's business sector. A priority of the City is to better embrace tourism, improve gateways, and draw traffic into the heart of our community.

A Multi-Modal Trailhead Center is a destination point that will strongly enhance the attraction of the Gitchi-Gami Bike Trail, the Superior Hiking Trail, the Northshore Trail, and other local trails. For walkers and runners who do not want to utilize the trails, also have an option to walk/run the city safely because the entire city has connecting sidewalks and is connected to the trailhead. The proposed facility will be a year-round facility unlike most wayside rests that are only seasonal. People

traveling along both the Scenic Byways will have safe and easy access to the Trailhead location. The location of the Trailhead will be located within the center of town, drawing traffic from the Highway. The business sector of Silver Bay is all within a short walking distance from the Trailhead thus providing amenities such as grocery store, restaurants, automotive parts, car wash, hardware, banking, liquor, and convenience stores. The increased foot traffic into our local businesses will have an immediate and welcoming impact to the business community. The area also is located near several churches, scenic overlooks, and other recreational amenities such as tennis courts, indoor and outdoor skating facilities, horseshoe courts, pickleball courts, ball fields, swimming pool, and gymnasium.

QUALITY OF LIFE/TREND: Per the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the September 20, 2018 stats from the Outdoor Recreational Satellite Account (ORSA), shows that outdoor recreation economy account for \$412 billion of current-dollar GDP in 2016, which grew 1.7% faster than the growth for the overall US economy. Silver Bay is projecting the Trailhead to be used by more than 20,000 people on an annual basis. Although these numbers are hard to predict and we feel they are conservative, information used to support this estimate include MnDOT average daily traffic counts (3600 vehicles along the Superior National Forest Scenic Byway and 4100 along the North Shore Scenic Byway); The Gitchi-Gami Bike trail 2015-2016 usage study showing an average daily count of 1,640 people for just that portion of Silver Bay to Gooseberry State Park; MnDOT report for visitors to the Silver Bay Marina, and the increase in Silver Bay's lodging tax, which increased 19% in Jan-April timeframe compared to the same period LY and is even higher when compared to the same time frame in the last 10 years.

Project Timeline

July 2020 - Begin Engineering the Final Design
December - 2020 - Plans and Specifications completed
January 2021 - Advertise for Bids
March 2021 - Bids accepted
April 2021 - Bid awarded, contracts signed, permits completed
June 2021 - Construction begins
May 2022 - Multi-Modal Trailhead Center Open

Other Considerations

This project will be located in an Opportunity Zone tract - ID #27075370300 - Lake County

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City is not requesting any operating subsidies for this project. We are only requesting capital dollars.

Who will own the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will operate the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Silver Bay. There will be no leases.

Public Purpose

The Multi-Modal Trailhead Center will serve as both a wayside rest and trailhead center for the public. The project will provide safe and accessible access to trail systems such as the Gitchi-Gami Bike Trail, Superior National Forest Hiking Trail, the Northshore/CJ Ramstad ATV and Snowmobile trail, and other local trail systems. This project's outreach is local, regional, statewide, and national as it is located along two highly utilized scenic byways - Superior National Forest and North Shore. This project will be part of the City's Parks and Recreation Department.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City has not received any prior appropriations relating to the development of a Multi-Modal Trailhead Center.

Project Contact Person

Lana Fralich
Administrator
218-226-4408
lanaf@silverbay.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.9 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Multimodal Trailhead Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$20 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$1,880 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$580 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$180 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,040 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,800 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| South Haven Water System Improvements | 1 | GO | 418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | GF | 355 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 773 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 355 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

South Haven Water System Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$773

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$773,000 in state funds is requested for predesign, design, land acquisition, and construction of two drinking water wells, pumphouse and watermain connections for the City of South Haven to replace the low producing aging well that is the sole source of drinking water and to repaint the City water tower that contains lead paint.

Project Description

The project will include the design and construction of two municipal water wells. These new wells will be relocated to an aquifer that provide the necessary quality for safe drinking, and sufficient capacity to supply the City of South Haven’s needs. Included in this project is the construction of a pumphouse mechanical/electrical, controls, chemical feed systems and, connective piping to the existing water distribution system. In addition, the project will include repainting the 52 year old water tower that has significant paint loss and has been determined that the paint contains lead. To locate a site that has the water needs of the city, land acquisition may be needed. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$1,546,000.

The Minnesota Department of Health recommends a community have pumping capacity equal to the average daily consumption with the largest well out of production. South Haven does not meet this standard if Well #1 is not in operation. **The city is out of water.**

Implement construction of new wells, pumphouse, mechanical/electrical, chemical feed systems tasks in one to two years.

Project Rationale

This project is an **immediate priority** for the city of South Haven’s residents. The city is using they’re only operating well that could quit working at any time leaving residents and businesses without water. Well #1 (South Haven’s only operable well) is nearing the end of its useful service. The well if over pumped for long periods of time will pump shale into the distribution system. Just recently, when the city was conducting spring flushing of their water system the city ran dry of water. With the pump capacity of 50 gallons per minute the pump ran for 24 hours to fill the tower. Stressing the old well to the maximum. South Haven does not have a backup well. If well #1 went down for any reason the city will be out of water. The current well does not meet current normal water usage and provides only minimal firefighting capabilities.

This project would provide the city with the security of adequate supply, quality, safe drinking water for the residence for many years.

The water tower paint prematurely failed on the exterior of the tank and has left exposed metal. Without immediate repair the water tower will rust and fail prematurely.

Project Timeline

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| May, 2019 | Submit for 2020 DWRF PPL |
| June, 2020 | Put on 2020 DWRF IUP |
| October – December, 2020 | Design |
| January, 2021 | Bidding |
| May, 2021 | Begin Construction |
| September, 2021 | Construction Complete |

Other Considerations

This is an immediate priority for the city of South Haven. The city understands the urgency of this project to provide residence with the basic need of life, water. The current well situation with the only source of water is a well that is at the end of its useful life with no back up source at all.

South Haven has been hit hard with many recent basic infrastructure failures. This spring 2019 flooding overwhelmed the main lift station intown which overwhelmed the wastewater system. An expensive fix to the main lift station is needed. The construction of a drainage system in town is needed to minimize flooding in the future. Much needed road repair in many streets in town which require attention. With all these major infrastructure immediate needs the city is overwhelmed and of great need for assistance.

Funding consideration for the wells/pumphouse/water tower painting project would be greatly appreciated and a step in the right direction for South Havens infrastructure issues.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The state bonding funds will help alleviate the extreme hardship of cost increases for the necessary water system improvements.

Who will own the facility?

City of South Haven

Who will operate the facility?

City of South Haven

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of South Haven

Public Purpose

The water system improvements will benefit the entire city population and the business community. Drinking water and fire fighting are essential to the community survival.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Karen Flaten
Administrator/Clerk

320-236-2424

sohavenc@windstream.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

South Haven Water System Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$418 | \$0 | \$0 |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$355 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$773 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,546 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$25 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$308 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,213 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,546 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Expand Small Range for Qualifications | 1 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Large Shooting Range Updates | 2 | GF | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Shooting Range HVAC System | 3 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fire Tower Equipment | 4 | GF | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Expansion of Defensive Tactics Gym | 5 | GO | 700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Trench Collapse Simulator | 6 | GF | 500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tactical Training Structure | 7 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,700 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Expand Small Range for Qualifications

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000
Priority Ranking: 1
Project Summary: Expand the 45 ft shooting range to a 75 ft shooting range.

Project Description

Knock out the east wall of the 4-lane firing range and move the shooting area back 10 yards. Expanding the range would make it a training qualifying range.

Project Rationale

The facility is near capacity for use of the larger 12-lane firing range, which has distance range from 25 - 50 yards. Twenty-five yards is required for law enforcement firearms qualifications. By expanding the 4-lane range from 15 - 25 yards, we could accommodate multiple police agencies for their qualification exercises. Using the smaller range when possible results in a cost savings to the agency and to better energy efficiency than the larger range.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations

This expansion would also benefit our public range access offerings, such as the MN Permit to Carry courses which are held here twice monthly.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Power Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire departments from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the general public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities.

Expanded use by general public for public access classes and shooting.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The SMPSTF received \$500,000 of the \$7M in original costs to build the facility, which was completed in 2004.

The MN DNR recently awarded SMPSTF with \$23,000 in matching funds for the installation of ADA door paddles to facilitate visits from the public.

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Expand Small Range for Qualifications

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Large Shooting Range Updates

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: New target carrier and replace lead-contaminated acoustical foam with rubber berms with a steel trap for the long (75 ft) shooting range.

Project Description

The large shooting range contains equipment with lead. New technology in shooting ranges uses rubber berms with a steel trap as an alternative. Acoustical panels throughout both ranges are lead contaminated and require replacement within the next year.

Project Rationale

Removal of lead in shooting ranges is highly beneficial to the health and safety of users. It also saves the facility money. Currently the facility spends about \$20,000 a year cleaning lead from the ranges. This would no longer be necessary with the rubber and steel traps.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Power Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director. The City of Edina provides financial, human resources and I.T. services.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire departments from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities and the public that uses the shooting range.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Large Shooting Range Updates

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Shooting Range HVAC System

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000
Priority Ranking: 3
Project Summary: Retrofit the shooting range HVAC system to HEPA filtration.

Project Description

For this project, the South Metro Public Safety Training Facility will remove and dispose of old shooting range HVAC system and replace with new to HEPA filtration. Ongoing costs will be the responsibility of the owner agencies.

Project Rationale

Historically, indoor shooting ranges have had less than adequate air quality resulting in health issues. The South Metro Training Facility was built in 2004. Environmental standards have changed since then with regards to air quality in shooting ranges. The HVAC system heat wheel broke in winter of 2019 and caused disruption in service. While the South Metro Public Safety Training Facility takes great care to monitor air quality by measuring for lead, all new firing ranges now require HEPA filtration systems. This project provides efficiencies for future required updates.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Power Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire departments from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities and to offer ongoing opportunities for members of the general public to make use of the facilities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The SMPSTF received \$500,000 of the \$7M in original costs to build the facility, which was completed in 2004.

The MN DNR recently awarded SMPSTF with \$23,000 in matching funds for the installation of ADA door paddles to facilitate visits from the public.

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Shooting Range HVAC System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Fire Tower Equipment**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$500**Priority Ranking:** 4**Project Summary:** Update fire burning training equipment and software in the fire tower.**Project Description**

The fire burning equipment in the fire tower was upgraded in 2011. Technology is rapidly changing on fire simulator training equipment. Today's models are more realistic, better for the environment and can provide high student throughput. New software can provide more realistic alarm systems to the tower.

Project Rationale

To provide state-of-the-art training equipment and facilities for local firefighters.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

None

Who will own the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Power Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire departments from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The SMPSTF received \$500,000 of the \$7M in original costs to build the facility, which was completed in 2004.

The MN DNR recently awarded SMPSTF with \$23,000 in matching funds for the installation of ADA door paddles to facilitate visits from the public.

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Fire Tower Equipment

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$30 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$470 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Expansion of Defensive Tactics Gym**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$700 |
| Priority Ranking: | 5 |
| Project Summary: | Expand size of defensive tactics (DT) training room. |

Project Description

The Defensive Tactics (DT) room is a multi-purpose gym used for training in principles and concepts for controlling subjects before, during and after use-of-force encounters. Agencies and trainers perform control holds, escorts, takedowns, restraint, handcuffing, and ground control on cushioned mats. For this project, the east wall would be knocked down and the room extended 10 yards.

Project Rationale

Expanding the space from 1,200 square feet to 2,000 square feet will provide the opportunity to conduct more realistic and safer training situations. A larger room also provides opportunities for larger training classes.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Power Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director.

The City of Edina provides financial, human resources and I.T. services.

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire departments from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The SMPSTF received \$500,000 of the \$7M in original costs to build the facility, which was completed in 2004.

The MN DNR recently awarded SMPSTF with \$23,000 in matching funds for the installation of ADA door paddles to facilitate visits from the public.

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Expansion of Defensive Tactics Gym

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Trench Collapse Simulator**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$500**Priority Ranking:** 6**Project Summary:** Build a trench collapse simulator outside the training facility for fire agencies training exercises.**Project Description**

Trench collapse simulator would provide opportunity for rescuers to practice shoring and rescue techniques in trenches of various angles, depths, and configurations. Can be above or below ground. Simulator should be constructed in such a way as to create confined space rescue training opportunities.

Project Rationale

Currently, Lino Lakes is the closest trench collapse simulator in the metro area. The South Metro Training Facility can provide this training opportunity to the multiple agencies that use the center.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies****Who will own the facility?**

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Power Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director. The City of Edina provides financial, human resources and I.T. services.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire department personnel from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The SMPSTF received \$500,000 of the \$7M in original costs to build the facility, which was completed in 2004.

The MN DNR recently (Feb 2019) awarded SMPSTF with \$23,000 in matching funds for the installation of ADA door paddles to facilitate visits from the public.

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Trench Collapse Simulator

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$20 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$430 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Tactical Training Structure

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,000

Priority Ranking: 7

Project Summary: Construct a new indoor firing range for close contact law enforcement training.
This building would also house a structural collapse simulator for firefighter training (separate project request).

Project Description

A tactical training structure is a simulated ammunition small arms shooting range used to train law enforcement personnel for close contact engagements in urban combat environments. They are designed to mimic residential, commercial and industrial spaces. They are often used to acquaint personnel in infiltrating structures and the methods used to overwhelm the targets in the quickest and most efficient manner. The scenarios trained for include room and apartment clearing, door breaching and the inclusion of hostage or noncombatant targets. At the South Metro Training Facility, currently the fire tower is being used as a tactical combat house. This is not the intended purpose of the fire tower.

Project Rationale

A tactical combat house was on the list of capital improvement projects when the training facility opened in 2004. It was scratched from the original project for lack of funds. Fifteen years later, training coordinators continue to inquire about this, to enrich their training exercise.

Project Timeline

2020

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility (SMPSTF), a Joint Powers Agreement between the Metropolitan Airports Commission, and the Cities of Bloomington, Eden Prairie, and Edina (aka Owners).

Who will operate the facility?

The South Metro Public Safety Training Facility staff members under the oversight of the Facilities Director.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Police and fire departments from the Owners, contracting and renting agencies, and members of the public.

Public Purpose

Provide on-going high quality training for first responders who serve our communities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The SMPSTF received \$500,000 of the \$7M in original costs to build the facility, which was completed in 2004.

The MN DNR recently awarded SMPSTF with \$23,000 in matching funds for the installation of ADA door paddles to facilitate visits from the public.

Project Contact Person

Debra Fields
Facilities Director
952-903-5715
dfields@edinamn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. To most effectively address training needs for municipal public safety services, the Governor recommends \$500,000 for an evaluation of training facilities across the state.

South Metro Public Safety Training Facility JPB

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Tactical Training Structure

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$10 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$910 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$30 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Concord Street (State Highway 156) Utilities | 1 | GO | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,366 | 0 | 0 |
| Doug Woog Arena HVAC | 2 | GO | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Renovation of Lysdale Hangar at Fleming Field | 3 | GF | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,700 | 0 | 0 | 2,366 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,350 | 0 | 0 | 2,366 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 350 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Concord Street (State Highway 156) Utilities

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$6,000

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of South St. Paul is seeking \$6 million in State assistance to aid in upgrading/replacing utilities (water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and street lighting) on Concord Street in association with MnDot's proposed turnback of this roadway. While roadway funding is secured, utility costs fall to the City and the estimated cost cripples our ability to complete other planned work in the community.

Project Description

MnDot has proposed to turnback Trunk Highway #156 through South St. Paul with Dakota County assuming responsibility for the portion from I-494 to Grand Avenue. The City of SSP will take the remainder of the roadway from Grand Avenue to our north boundary at Annapolis Street. As part of the turnback process, the road surface and related appurtenances will be improved through-out the project limits.

The various project components were part of a scoping study undertaken by Kimley-Horn during 2018 that generated an overall project budget of \$31,496,000. Funding has been secured for the roadway and related costs as indicated below:

- Federal Freight Funds - \$7,560,000
- MnDot Funds - \$7,500,000
- MnDot Mainstreet Funds - \$5,000,000
- MnDot Turnback Funds - \$4,436,000
- Total \$24,696,000

The project components that the City is responsible for are as follows:

- Water Main - \$2,768,000
- Storm Sewer - \$1,195,000
- Street Lights - \$1,171,000
- Sanitary Sewer - \$866,000
- Total \$6,000,000

The Project Budget also contemplates the City will provide \$1,000,000 of Special Assessment contribution to the project. That amount is subject to compliance with Minnesota Statutes Chapter 429 and the "benefits received" test.

Project Rationale

The need for this project is the result of MnDot's desire to turnback State Trunk Highway #156 (Concord Street) within the city of South St. Paul. Dakota County will take the portion from Interstate

494 to Grand Avenue. The City of SSP will take the roadway from Grand Avenue to Annapolis Street (our northern boundary).

As noted in the Project Description, funding has been secured for the roadway upgrades. However, utilities also need to be upgraded before investing millions of dollar in the road surface. Those costs fall entirely on the City!

While this project will enhance the economic vitality of the community and upgrade a road that serves as a congestion reliever for State Highway 52 in the southeast metro region, its timing has put extreme financial strain on our utility funds. \$6,000,000 in previously unprogrammed utility upgrades cripples our ability to do other planned and needed work throughout the City without overburdening our utility customers and/or taxpayers.

We are already implementing multiple years of annual eight percent (8%) rate increases in all our utility funds to help address our infrastructure needs. The City is also issuing debt to spread burden out over multiple years. But, like many older cities, our infrastructure needs significant attention and those costs easily outstrip our revenue generation capabilities.

Another key consideration is the City of South St. Paul has been designated an "economically depressed area" by the United States Department of Commerce. South St. Paul also has the lowest tax base of the 11 major communities in Dakota County while also having the second highest municipal tax rate. As a result, we need the State's help to enable us to address Concord's utility infrastructure needs without compromising our ability to address other infrastructure needs throughout the community and overburdening our citizens and businesses.

Project Timeline

Predesign Work - Already underway in association with a MnDot Cooperative Agreement.

Final Design - Early Winter of 2020

Right-of-Way Acquisition - 2020

Bidding - Early 2021

Commence Construction - April of 2021

Substantial Completion of Construction - November of 2021

Final Completion - July of 2022

Other Considerations

- Federal Freight Funds of \$7.56 million need to be expended within the timeframe proposed by the project or they will be lost as a funding source.
- Special assessments of \$1,000,000 are contemplated. This is an estimate at this point and the City will need to follow the public improvement process pursuant Minnesota Statute Chapter 429.
- The City also needs to resolve right-of-way issues as part of the project. Land costs for easement acquisition are provided for in the roadway portion of the budget.
- It would be irresponsible to ignore the utility needs under the Trunk Highway #156 with the investment contemplated by this project. However, if not for the turnback, those improvements would not have occurred within the timeframe proposed by this project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There will be no on-going impact on any State operating subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

The City of South St. Paul will own all utility facilities (water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and street lights).

Who will operate the facility?

The City of South St. Paul will operate all utility facilities (water main, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and street lights).

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Citizens and businesses of South St. Paul

Public Purpose

The utility work needed as part of the Concord Project addresses basic life, safety, and welfare responsibilities of the City in providing essential services to the citizens and businesses of the community.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous bonding appropriations.
Other MnDot allocations are noted in the Project Description section.

Project Contact Person

Joel Hanson
City Administrator
651-554-3272
Jhanson@southstpaul.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.366 million in general obligation bonds for street light and storm sewer replacement.

(\$ in thousands)

Concord Street (State Highway 156) Utilities

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$16,936 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,560 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$31,496 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$31,496 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$31,496 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Doug Woog Arena HVAC

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$350

Priority Ranking: 2

Project Summary: The City of South St. Paul is requesting \$350,000 of State assistance for the installation of a new HVAC system in Rink 1 at the Doug Woog Arena. The City will contribute the first \$50,000 for a total project cost of \$400,000.

Project Description

In October 1962, Doug Woog Arena was built as a one-ice sheet facility and was privately owned by Wakota Arena Incorporated, which consisted of 650 shareholders and was named *The Cow Palace*. It was built on ten acres of land for the cost of \$550,000. A year later, the name was changed to “Wakota” Arena, a combination of Washington and Dakota counties. In 1977, the City of South St. Paul purchased the arena for \$375,000. In 2015, the arena was renamed Doug Woog Arena to honor native hockey great Doug Woog. Woog played high school hockey for the South St. Paul Packers becoming a first team All-State player and leading the Packers to four State Tournaments. Woog went on to play for the University of Minnesota, earning team captain, MVP and first team All-American honors his junior year. Woog later became the head coach of the South St. Paul Packers High School Hockey Team from 1977-1985, and progressed to an assistant coaching position with the US Olympic hockey team in 1984. In 1985, Woog was named head coach of the United States World Junior Hockey Team, competing in Helsinki, Finland. Woog went on to coach the University of Minnesota Golden Gophers Men’s Hockey Team from 1985-1999 and was inducted into the United States Hockey Hall of Fame in 2002. The arena is now over 50 years old and has undergone three substantial renovations. The first in 1989, with the addition of a large concession stand and lobby area added to the south end of the building as well as an upstairs viewing room. In 1997, Rink #2 was built in addition to two large office spaces and the Community Learning Center (CLC) for the South St. Paul School District. The third renovation occurred in 2014 with the conversion of the refrigeration system from Freon to ammonia and the remodel of the original rink creating six new locker rooms, an off-ice training facility, community meeting space, and elevated warm viewing areas. The spectator radiant heating system is due for replacement. The estimated cost is \$50,000. The project proposed by this funding request would eliminate the radiant system and replace it with a comprehensive heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system for Rink 1 that would make the space usable on a year-round basis. Without this system, warm weather usage for dry floor events is virtually impossible due to excessive heat and humidity conditions within the building. The system proposed would eliminate this issue and make the space available for indoor, dry-floor events such as community gatherings, trade shows, graduations, and a host of other opportunities. The additional cost for upgrading the HVAC system in Rink 1 is \$350,000. The City would contribute the first \$50,000 (as offset for replacing the radiant heating system) to fully fund the estimated \$400,000 project cost. Note: Rink 2 already has this system in place and an ice surface is maintained year-round.

Project Rationale

- Doug Woog Arena in South St. Paul is a regional facility serving the southeast metro area.
- In 2016, the State enacted a new Mighty Ducks program to help arenas pay to eliminate the R-22 refrigerant in ice-making systems. With required equipment upgrades, that cost was approximately \$1.1 million for Woog Arena. That was paid for entirely by the taxpayers of the City of South St. Paul in 2014 as part of a referendum project. As a result, we were not able to take advantage of the new Mighty Ducks program.
- The improved HVAC system will make a regional facility more available to area users on a year-round basis.

Project Timeline

Finalize State Agreement - 3/1/21
Complete Design HVAC System - 4/15/2021
Bid Improvement - 5/31/2021
Start Construction - 7/15/2021
Complete Construction - 9/30/2021

Other Considerations

Here are some other factors to evaluate when considering this project:

- In 2014, the City of South St. Paul upgraded the ice cooling system at its own cost and could not take advantage of the 2016 Mighty Ducks program.
- The City of South St. Paul is classified as an economically depressed area by the United States Department of Commerce. When considered in conjunction with our low tax base and high municipal tax rate, the City's ability to undertake this needed improvement on its own would place additional financial burden on our low income residents.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No other State operating subsidies will be required.

Who will own the facility?

The City of South St. Paul will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of South St. Paul will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents of the southeast metro area people consisting of Ramsey, Washington, and Dakota Counties will be the primary users, but the facility also hosts visitors from throughout the State of Minnesota as well as from other States for hockey or ice skating competitions.

Public Purpose

The Minnesota Supreme Court has stated that activities that promote the following objectives for the benefit of all the city's residents further a public purpose:• Public health• Safety• General welfare• Security• Prosperity• Contentment. This project promotes the general well-being; prosperity and contentment of our area's residents. Furthermore, operation of recreational facilities is a"public purpose" that cities are authorized to carry out.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous State appropriations

Project Contact Person

Joel Hanson
City Administrator
651-554-3272
jhanson@southstpaul.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Doug Woog Arena HVAC

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$20 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$380 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Renovation of Lysdale Hangar at Fleming Field

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$350

Priority Ranking: 3

Project Summary: The City of South St. Paul is seeking \$350,000 of State assistance to renovate the Lysdale Hangar at Fleming Field Airport. This hangar was originally constructed by the U.S. Navy in the 1940's and has local historical value in addition to economic development potential for existing airport based businesses.

Project Description

The Lysdale Hangar was constructed in the 1940's by the US Navy and was part of the facilities used to train new pilots including former President George H. W. Bush. The Navy turned over ownership of the airport including the Lysdale hangar, to the City of South St. Paul. This hangar has also served as home to a Minnesota Aviation History Museum.

Given the age of the hangar, the original door now leaks when it rains and snows thereby requiring upgrades for structural integrity. Obviously, it also not energy efficient. The estimated cost to put a new door on this hangar is approximately \$150,000. A fire suppression system is also needed to bring the building up to code. Together with other ancillary improvements, this component is estimated to cost an additional \$200,000.

These improvements will bring the hangar up to current codes and standards thereby making it usable for other prospective tenants including the possibility of airport based businesses to enable their expansion within the City and add job growth to the area.

Project Rationale

The rationale for this project is as follows:

- Hangar has historic value as part of the Fleming Field Airport.
- Hangar has economic development potential for other "on airport" businesses.
- Structurally, the hangar warrants this rehabilitation.
- The City has been designated an "economically depressed area" by the United States Department of Commerce.
- The existing Airport Fund revenues streams are currently inadequate to address this project with City resources given we are planning a runway/taxi way reconstruction project.
- Fleming Field serves a regional benefit for recreational aviators and local airport based businesses with significant job growth potential.

Project Timeline

- Funds Encumbered - February 1, 2021

- Design work completed April 2021
- Project Bidding May of 2021
- Commencement of Construction - July of 2021
- Project Completion - December 2021

Other Considerations

The City is financially handicapped to preserve this important structure given the planned reconstruction of the runway/taxiway at the airport. Financing this through our general tax levy is also problematic given our limited tax base and already high municipal tax rate. Traditional airport subsidies are not available for this project. Finally, this project was financed by the State in 2010, but the City was not able to take advantage of the opportunity due a personnel issues involving the airport manager at the time. That would not be the case this time!

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project will not have any impact on other State operating subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

The City of South St. Paul will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of South St. Paul will operate the facility but lease it to another entity.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

We anticipate this hangar will be leased to an existing "on airport" private business for job expansion. An additional option could be a non-profit venture such as the Commemorative Air Force or the Civil Air Patrol.

Public Purpose

Description of Previous Appropriations

This project was funded by the State in 2010 in the amount of \$300,000. The legislation was sponsored by the late Senator James Metzen and Representative Rick Hansen. Due to a personnel issue involving the airport manager at the time, the City was not in a position to take advantage of that funding opportunity.

Project Contact Person

Joel Hanson
City Administrator
651-497-1577
jhanson@southstpaul.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Renovation of Lysdale Hangar at Fleming Field

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$350 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$15 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$335 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$350 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Spring Park Critical Infrastructure | 1 | GO | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,500 | 1,500 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Spring Park Critical Infrastructure

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: 1.\$1,000,000 is requested for design and reconstruction of street and utilities along Lake Minnetonka shoreline for the West Arm Rd W Street and Utility Project. 2.\$3,800,000 is requested for design and reconstruction of street and utilities along Sunset Dr, and the streets that connect to Sunset Dr. 3.\$1,200,000 is requested for design and reconstruction of street and utilities along Black Lake Rd, Kings Rd, Channel Rd, and Rose Hill Ln areas.

Project Description

1.The West Arm Road West area has 1 road that was built in the 1960s. Sanitary and Water utilities are past their life expectancy and require replacement with a road reconstruction. West Arm Road West was last reconstructed in 1970, approximately 25 years past the last recommended reconstruction. In order to lessen run-off impacts to Lake Minnetonka, a storm water system will need to be designed and constructed. The remaining water and sanitary utilities are located in an easement along the lake shore of Lake Minnetonka. These utilities are past their life expectancy and consist of vitrified clay pipe and cast iron pipe. There is no direct access to the utilities, so the City intends to take a proactive stance and rehab/replace utilities prior to an emergency situation. This project may also include a new road from the intersection of Shoreline Dr and Island Dr, north to West Arm Road West. Signals, ADA ramp improvements, tie-in to Dakota Regional Trail may be part of this project. Total construction cost is expected to be \$1,000,000, plus an additional \$125,000 for right of way acquisition/easements. The project is planned to be funded with Special Assessments, Sanitary Utility Funds, Water Utility Funds, Bonding, and Grants.

2. The Sunset Drive Area Improvement project includes Sunset Drive, Hazeldell Ave, Lilac Road, Mapleton Ave, Northern Ave, Park Lane, Togo Road, Dickson Ave, and Budd Lane. The majority of these roads were built in 1968, with only pothole filling and random maintenance performed for the last 50 years. All of these roads are 25 years past the last recommended reconstruction. Sanitary and Water utilities are past their life expectancy and require replacement with a road reconstruction. These utilities are past their life expectancy and consist of vitrified clay pipe and cast iron pipe. In order to lessen run-off impacts to Lake Minnetonka, a storm water system will need to be designed and constructed. The City intends to take a proactive stance and rehab/replace utilities prior to an emergency situation. This project may also include ADA ramp improvements, and tie-in to Dakota Regional Trail. Total construction cost is expected to be \$3,800,000, plus an additional \$500,000 for right of way acquisition/easements. The project is planned to be funded with Special Assessments, Sanitary Utility Funds, Water Utility Funds, Bonding, and Grants.

3. The Black Lake Road Area Improvement project includes Black Lake Road, Kings Road, Channel Road, and Rose Hill Lane areas. The majority of these roads were built in 1968, with only pothole filling and random maintenance performed for the last 50 years. All of these roads are 25 years past the last recommended reconstruction. Sanitary and Water utilities are past their life expectancy and require replacement with a road reconstruction. These utilities are past their life expectancy and

consist of vitrified clay pipe and cast iron pipe. In order to lessen run-off impacts to Lake Minnetonka, a storm water system will need to be designed and constructed. The City intends to take a proactive stance and rehab/replace utilities prior to an emergency situation. This project may also include ADA ramp improvements, and tie-in to Dakota Regional Trail. Total construction cost is expected to be \$1,200,000, plus an additional \$500,000 for right of way acquisition/easements. The project is planned to be funded with Special Assessments, Sanitary Utility Funds, Water Utility Funds, Bonding, and Grants.

Project Rationale

1. The sanitary, water and sewer was built in the 1960's. The cast iron water main needs to be replaced due to its age and proximity to Lake Minnetonka. The sanitary sewer and manholes show moderate to higher levels of Inflow/Infiltration, which is extra cost for the City and Property Owners. The area lacks curb, gutter, and a storm water system. The storm water run-off will need to be treated prior to being discharged to the Lake. The current access point from West Arm Road West to Shoreline Drive is largely inaccessible during rush hour due to its location, lack of signals, and multiple lanes of traffic to cross. The City would like to acquire Right of Way and construct a new road from Island Drive/Shoreline Drive north to West Arm Road West.
2. The sanitary, water and sewer was built in the 1960's. The cast iron water main needs to be replaced due to its age and proximity to Lake Minnetonka. The sanitary sewer and manholes show moderate to higher levels of Inflow/Infiltration, which is extra cost for the City and Property Owners. The area lacks curb, gutter, and a storm water system. The storm water run-off will need to be treated prior to being discharged to the Lake. The majority of these roads were built in 1968, with only pothole filling and random maintenance performed for the last 50 years. All of these roads are 25 years past the last recommended reconstruction.
3. The sanitary, water and sewer was built in the 1960's. The cast iron water main needs to be replaced due to its age and proximity to Lake Minnetonka. The sanitary sewer and manholes show moderate to higher levels of Inflow/Infiltration, which is extra cost for the City and Property Owners. The area lacks curb, gutter, and a storm water system. The storm water run-off will need to be treated prior to being discharged to the Lake. The majority of these roads were built in 1968, with only pothole filling and random maintenance performed for the last 50 years. All of these roads are 25 years past the last recommended reconstruction.

Project Timeline

1. June 2019 – Topographic Survey/Predesign
August 2019 – Feasibility Report to City Council (Report funded by City)
November 2019 – City Council Resolution Accepting Report and Order Public Hearing
December 2019 – City Council Orders Improvements and Preparation of Plans/Specs
March 2020 – City Council Approves Plans and Specs, Orders Ad for Bid
May 2020 – Begin Construction
October/November 2020 – Complete Construction
2. Fall 2019 – Coordinate Sunset Drive design with Hennepin County
August 2020 – Feasibility Report to City Council (Report funded by City)
September 2020 – City Council Resolution Accepting Report and Order Public Hearing
October 2020 – City Council Orders Improvements and Preparation of Plans/Specs
March 2022 – City Council Approves Plans and Specs, Orders Ad for Bid
May 2022 – Begin Construction
October/November 2023 – Complete Construction
3. June 2023 – Topographic Survey/Predesign

August 2023 – Feasibility Report to City Council (Report funded by City)
November 2023 – City Council Resolution Accepting Report and Order Public Hearing
December 2023 – City Council Orders Improvements and Preparation of Plans/Specs
March 2024 – City Council Approves Plans and Specs, Orders Ad for Bid
May 2024 – Begin Construction
October/November 2024 – Complete Construction

Other Considerations

1. The City currently lacks the taxable base and funding necessary to meet the needs of the failing infrastructure. The majority of the City infrastructure was built in the 1960s and requires improvements prior to emergency repairs. The City has developed an Asset Management Plan to serve as a guide for ranking and planning projects and identifying needs.
2. The City currently lacks the taxable base and funding necessary to meet the needs of the failing infrastructure. The majority of the City infrastructure was built in the 1960s and requires improvements prior to emergency repairs. The City has developed an Asset Management Plan to serve as a guide for ranking and planning projects and identifying needs.
3. The City currently lacks the taxable base and funding necessary to meet the needs of the failing infrastructure. The majority of the City infrastructure was built in the 1960s and requires improvements prior to emergency repairs. The City has developed an Asset Management Plan to serve as a guide for ranking and planning projects and identifying needs.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

1. This project will largely be designed/constructed in 2020. The budget request is limited to 2020 for the amount listed in the above section.
2. This project will largely be designed in 2021 and constructed 2022-2023. The budget request is limited to 2021-2023 for the amount listed in the above section.
3. This project will largely be designed in 2023 and constructed 2024. The budget request is limited to 2023-2024 for the amount listed in the above section.

Who will own the facility?

City of Spring Park

Who will operate the facility?

City of Spring Park

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Spring Park

Public Purpose

1. The public purpose of the project is to improve failing public infrastructure, improve ADA accessibility, provide tie-ins to regional trail, and provide safer signalized intersection.
2. The public purpose of the project is to improve failing public infrastructure, improve ADA accessibility, provide curb and gutter, widen road to meet National Fire Protection Agency Standards, improve drainage and treat storm water and provide tie-ins to regional trail.
3. The public purpose of the project is to improve failing public infrastructure, improve ADA accessibility, provide curb and gutter, widen road to meet National Fire Protection Agency Standards, improve drainage and treat storm water.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Dan Tolsma
City Administrator
952-471-9051
dtolsma@ci.spring-park.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Spring Park Critical Infrastructure

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$2,000 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$2,000 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$75 | \$75 | \$100 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$150 | \$150 | \$200 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$75 | \$75 | \$100 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,200 | \$1,200 | \$1,600 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$2,000 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | N/A |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| St. Cloud Municipal Athletic Complex Expansion and Renovation | 1 | GO | 12,150 | 0 | 0 | 12,150 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 12,150 | 0 | 0 | 12,150 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 12,150 | 0 | 0 | 12,150 | 0 | 0 |

St. Cloud Municipal Athletic Complex Expansion and Renovation

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$12,150

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of St Cloud is requesting \$12.15 million in state funds to design, renovate, expand, and improve the St. Cloud Municipal Athletic Complex (MAC.) The MAC is home to intercollegiate sports teams from St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud Technical Community College and the College of Saint Benedict, plus six high school teams and numerous amateur and youth sports organizations.

Project Description

The project comprises four elements:

- Demolition and reconstruction of Dick Putz Field (constructed in 1971), including full accessibility and the installation of synthetic turf. Synthetic turf will allow a significant increase in use and accommodate other sports in addition to baseball. Synthetic turf allows more usage each day than natural grass and extends the season, both spring and fall. Conversion to synthetic turf will also allow use of the field for sports such as lacrosse, soccer, softball, flag football and rugby, in addition to baseball;
- Installation of synthetic turf on Joe Faber Field (constructed in 1998), to increase usage in the same ways as Dick Putz Field;
- An addition of 36,500 square feet to the ice arena facility, including (1) a 9,500 s.f. West Lobby Addition that will improve ticketing and patron flow plus add business office and storage space; and (2) a 27,000 s.f. addition that will add five accessible locker rooms, accessible dryland training and sports medicine facilities, and additional storage and meeting space;
- Mechanical and environmental upgrades to the arena building, including replacement of the current R-22 refrigeration system, upgraded heating and cooling, accessibility upgrades, and installation of a roof-top solar array if financially feasible.

Project Rationale

St. Cloud’s Municipal Athletic Complex is much more than a community sports facility, and the net public benefit of the facility is significant. For almost 50 years, the MAC has been “home field” for multiple local high school baseball teams, saving those institutions the cost of owning, operating and maintaining their own stadiums. For more than 25 years, the MAC has been “home ice” for local high school and college hockey teams, saving those institutions the cost of owning, operating and maintaining their own ice arenas.

The MAC is the venue for numerous regional and state-wide tournaments, both in baseball and ice sports. The Minnesota State High School League has held baseball tournaments at the MAC since the 1970s. In 2018 the tournament count was 25.

The State of Minnesota has been, and continues to be, a major beneficiary of this municipal facility.

Both St. Cloud State University and St. Cloud Technical Community College field competitive inter-collegiate baseball programs at the MAC, and pay rental rates that cover only operating costs and make no contribution to the capital needs of the facility.

The MAC's operating budget is primarily earned revenue – 94% in 2018, with the remaining 6% coming from local lodging taxes. The City regularly increases rental rates and fees, as costs rise, and intends that user revenue will continue to support the cost of operations. The most recent fee increase was April 2019. The capital costs have, to this point, come from the City's Food and Beverage Tax Fund. The City has never received any capital assistance from the State.

The MAC is an important generator of local economic impact through hosted tournaments and competitions, plus college and Northwoods League games that attract out-of-town teams and fans. The St. Cloud Area Convention and Visitors Bureau worked directly with ten of the 25 tournaments held at the MAC in 2018, and estimated the impact as 27,000 visitors who spent nearly \$4.4 million and occupied 17,600 hotel rooms. Those estimates do not include visitor impact of the 36 games of the St. Cloud Rox Northwoods League team or the games of the St. Cloud State University Huskies or St. Cloud Technical Community College Cyclones. In May of 2019 the North American Hockey League moved a franchise to the community – the St. Cloud Blizzard, who will have 28 home games per season.

Project Timeline

The following schedule assumes funding in the 2020 legislative session. The City is proceeding with the predesign phase in 2019 with its own funds.

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Predesign | June 2019 to September 2019 |
| Schematic Design | July 2020 to September 2020 |
| Design Development | October 2020 to December 2020 |
| Construction Documents | January 2021 to March 2021 |
| Bidding and Contract Award | April 2021 to May 2021 |
| Construction | May 2021 to May 2022 |

Other Considerations

Athletic venues are expensive to construct, maintain, and operate and it makes very good sense to maximize the number of governments and organizations that utilize them for the broader public good. As noted, the State benefits directly by saving the cost of baseball facilities for its two teams in St. Cloud, but there are many other governments and organizations that similarly benefit from the City of St. Cloud's investments in the MAC.

Four hockey teams call our arena home and seven other high schools use it for some games or practices. The College of Saint Benedict's women's hockey team calls the MAC home. Central Minnesota Youth Hockey is one of the most active youth organizations in the state and our figure skating club is significant in scope. There are seven adult amateur hockey teams/clubs that use the MAC; and eleven private or nonprofit organizations who operate developmental camps at the MAC.

The baseball stadiums are home to four high school teams in addition to the State teams. There are five youth baseball teams and one adult amateur baseball teams. The St. Cloud Rox, as noted, play 36 regular season games at the MAC every season.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The request does not include any state operating funds. The City of St. Cloud will continue to fund the cost of operations primarily through user fees augmented by a small allocation of lodging tax proceeds.

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Cloud

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Cloud

Who will use or occupy the facility?

- St. Cloud State University,
- St. Cloud Technical Community College,
- the College of St. Benedict,
- Minnesota State High School League,
- St. Cloud Community Schools,
- Sauk Rapids-Rice Schools,
- Sartell-St. Stephen Schools,
- Cathedral High School,
- Central Minnesota Youth Hockey Association,
- St. Cloud Figure Skating Club,
- St. Cloud Rox Northwoods League baseball team,
- St. Cloud Blizzard North American Hockey League team,
- and more than 40 additional user organizations.

Public Purpose

The MAC serves as a community athletic center, making recreational opportunities available to members of the greater St. Cloud area, not just the citizens of the City of St. Cloud. In addition, the facilities are made available to other governments and educational institutions, enabling broad athletic participation at a far lower aggregate cost in the St. Cloud area. The public purpose includes providing two Minnesota State institutions with athletic venues.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Tony Goddard
Director, Community Services and Facilities
320-345-0316
tony.goddard@ci.stcloud.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$12.15 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

St. Cloud Municipal Athletic Complex Expansion and Renovation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$12,150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$8,150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$24,300 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$18,729 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$1,499 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,822 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$24,300 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center | 1 | GO | 4,000 | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 0 | 0 |
| East Park | 2 | GO | 300 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,300 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,300 | 0 | 0 | 4,300 | 0 | 0 |

Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$4,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | 4.0 million in state funds from 2018-2020 is requested to design, construct, furnish and equip a new facility that will be entitled the "Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center." The new center will be located in the City of St. Joseph serving communities surrounding and west of St. Joseph. |

Project Description

In 2014 the City of St. Joseph purchased a former school building from ISD 742 for \$ 2.3 M which included 13 acres of open land. The property was purchased using one half cent sales tax proceeds. The building currently is used by the School District and a music based daycare and will be available for repurposing in July 2018. The daycare facility will remain a tenant of the facility and that portion of the building will not be remodeled using public funds.

The facility was purchased so that it could be repurposed for a community center. The City Council formed a Community Center Committee in 2014 to discuss and solicit public input on what residents wanted in a community center. In 2016, the City hired HMA to assist the committee with conceptual drawings based on the feedback received. During the conceptual drawing stage, the committee and City Council conducted open houses and meetings to assure that what is being proposed for the facility is what the community is seeking.

Based on a considerable amount of input and discussion, the Community Center Committee has recommended the Council repurpose the existing facility to include the following:

- Remodel the existing gym and kitchen to create a multipurpose room that could be used by the community for events and gatherings. (8,000 Square Feet)
- Remodel a portion of the building to house the St. Joseph Historical Society, which has a large collection of artifacts. (6,000 square feet)
- Remodel a portion for the food shelf, which is used by a large geographical area, beyond the City of St. Joseph. (1,000 square feet)
- Remodel a portion to create rooms for senior and youth activities. These activities can include passive and active recreational needs to include: a meeting place to visit, play cards, pool, ping pong, library services, etc.. (6,500 square feet)

The Committee also recommended the City Council approve an addition to the facility housing three gyms with a second story walking path. While the entire facility will be entitled the *St. Joseph Community Center*, the new additional will be called the *Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center*. This is the portion that the City of St. Joseph is seeking help in funding.

The proposed addition includes the following:

- 35,000 square foot gym and second story track
- 1,350 square foot climbing wall

- 2,750 square foot Kid Zone

Based on current contracts for similar projects it is anticipated that the total project cost is estimated at \$12.5 M. The City recognizes that the project will be need to be divided into two phases, with the first phase the construction of the gym, climbing wall and kid zone. Funding for the project will include \$4 M in private donations, \$2.5 M State Bonding and \$6 M local option sales tax. Since the City will not have access to the existing facility until the Spring of 2018, it makes sense to construct the new addition of the gym as phase one, which was the highest ranked priority in the community

Phase 2 of the project would include the repurposing of the existing building and adding the historical society, food shelf and multi purpose rooms. It would be the intent to start construction of phase two after the first phase is completed.

Project Rationale

Since as early as 1977, residents of the St. Joseph area have been requesting the City construct a recreational facility that would allow for multi generational activities. What is difficult for the City Council is that residents in the surrounding Townships (St. Joseph and St. Wendel) consider themselves as St. Joseph residents, partly because their zip code is 56374, and they continue to request a facility for youth and senior programming. St. Joseph is located 8 miles from the St. Cloud area and without public transportation, it is difficult for some families to go to St. Cloud for recreational opportunities. The City completed a market study when a grocery store was being considered and it was determined that St. Joseph market area is to the west of St. Joseph. St. Joseph is not competing for with the St. Cloud area; rather, St. Joseph is the regional stop for residents from St. Stephen, Albany, Avon, Waite Park, St. Joseph Township, and St. Wendel Township to name a few. Residents have been looking for a safe place for the youth of area to engage in active and passive recreation.

In an ideal world St. Joseph would fund the project locally, but unfortunately, we have some large barriers. First, as stated above, many of the residents that would use this facility are not tax payers of the City. Many of the children go to school together and want to hang out with each other but lack the space to do so. When the City operated a summer recreation program, the City reached out to the jurisdictions from the youth that were enrolled for financing assistance and only one township provided financing, the other suggested that the City raise the registration fee to cover the cost. Unfortunately raising the cost would only make the program cost prohibitive and people felt like they were being excluded as they “live in St. Joseph” and have to pay a different fee.

The other barrier is that St. Joseph does not have any programmed opportunities for recreation. Cities in the St. Cloud area have continuing education opportunities for residents of all ages and offerings include a wide range of cultural and recreational programs. These programs are offered through ISD 742, of which St. Joseph is a part of. Unfortunately, none are provided in St. Joseph. St. Joseph is looking to construct a modest building with amenities for people of all ages to gather regardless of age.

Patti Wetterling at a recent meeting discussed how the community has been talking about a community center ever since she and Jerry moved to St. Joseph (which was 1977). A group of individuals approached them to see if they would allow the City to name the new addition the “Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center” to which she was honored. They have allowed the City to fund raise in the name of Jacob as people need closure and the recreation center would be that opportunity. Considerable thought was given to the design and it was important to make sure that the facility was not a remembrance of a terrible tragedy, rather a symbol as to how the community gathered together. One of the design features is the stamping of the eleven attributes that symbolize Jacob – Be fair, kind, understanding, honest, thankful, a good sport, a good friend, joyful, generous, gentle with others and positive.

The City is in the process of updating and re-writing the Comprehensive Plan. Part of the process included considerable public input, not only from current residents, but the surrounding Townships, western cities, local businesses and students. With over 1,000 responses, one of the top five requests was to provide additional recreation opportunities, both indoors and outdoors. The input was gathered through open houses, a survey and three pop up events at various venues. It is important to note that the input solicited was through a consultant that was not part of the community center discussion. It truly indicates that community members are looking for some type of community/recreation center.

Project Timeline

Once funding is received the City will start the construction design process. If funding is received in 2020, the design phase to get to bidding would take approximately one year and construction would follow in late 2021 with completion in late 2022.

Other Considerations

One of the largest constraints the City faces is financial. St. Joseph has one of the largest percentage of tax exempt property in Minnesota due primarily to the College and Monastery of St. Benedict. It is true that the College and Monastery are an asset to St. Joseph, but at the same time they are a liability. The tax-exempt property is nearing 40% of the total property market valuation, yet St. Joseph has to provide services without receiving revenue. The largest expense the City incurs is public safety, primarily police and fire services. Historically St. Joseph has kept the tax rate stable, but yet it is higher than some of the area cities. St. Joseph businesses suffer as the College can invite the public to eat at their facility, offering Sunday buffets, weddings, conferences, offer lodging at an unfair advantage to the businesses in St. Joseph. Raising taxes higher would only make the situation worse. The St. Joseph Police Department is taxed in the spring and fall with high overtime costs to cover the additional policing that is needed for youthful activities that occur during and after bar hours. The City continues to work with the tax exempt organizations to try and negotiate a payment in lieu of, but have not succeeded.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Joseph

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. Joseph

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents from St. Joseph and surrounding communities to the west.

Public Purpose

The proposed Recreation Center meets the public purpose as it promotes the following Public Health–promotes both the elderly and youth to engage in active and passive recreation, adding to the mental and physical wellbeing for all ages. * Safety– Provide a safe environment for youth senior exercise/recreation. * Prosperity–Encourage people to use the center adding economic prosperity to St. Joseph increasing commercial/ residential ventures. * General Welfare– Residents/Visitors have another opportunity for recreation promoting a healthy lifestyle.

Description of Previous Appropriations

n/a

Project Contact Person

Judy Weyrens

Administrator

320-229-9425

jweyrens@cityofstjoseph.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$4 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Jacob Wetterling Recreation Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$14,950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$16,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

East Park

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$300**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** \$300,000 in state funds is requested to design and construct a parking lot, canoe access and bathroom facilities for East Park which will be a regional park. While the Park is not developed, it is not uncommon to see cars parking along CR 121 as people are canoeing down the Sauk River.**Project Description**

In 2005 the City of St. Joseph was approached by a Developer to develop a large tract of land with a variety of housing types. As part of the preliminary plat, the City negotiated the conveyance of 95.08 acres adjacent to the Sauk River to the City to meet the parkland dedication requirements. The Park has been labeled "East Park". Most of the property conveyed would remain natural and could be used for camping, walking trails or a preservation area. During the planning stages the Stearns County Park Director approached the City and requested that the City acquire the Parkland for development as a regional park. While Stearns County did not have funds to develop the park, they offered their services to help plan and seek funding. Even though the property referred to was not public, people were already using the area to access the Sauk River.

Due to the down turn in the economy, the City did not acquire the parkland until 2016 and at the same time the Developer agreed to contribute \$50,000 to assist with development. In 2008 the City commissioned the development of a Park and Trail System Plan and included the East Park in the Plan. The Plan provides a guide for developing the entire 95.30 acres of which some of the components include a river access, boat landing, parking facilities and restrooms facilities. While the City intends to develop the entire park, fund requires that the City incrementalize the development.

Project Rationale

Research demonstrates the importance of recreation to staying active, socially engaged and physically fit. America's population, both young and old, is experiencing health-related issues associated with lack of exercise, compounded by the increasing popularity of the internet and other technologies that encourage a more sedentary and insular lifestyle.

The City of St. Joseph is committed to promoting healthy and active living and recently expended over \$1,000,000 in trail expansions to the Wobegon. Not many cities have access to major bike paths where miles are endless. Through the Comprehensive Plan process, residents have indicated that they are looking for a variety of recreational activities, both passive and active. The St. Joseph Park Board adopted the following mission statement: *To plan, develop, preserve, improve and maintain the City's parkland for a balanced and diverse park and trail system.* They further committed to the following goals:

- Promoting a sense of wellness and healthy lifestyles
- Providing a wholesome, enjoyable, safe, and aesthetically pleasing recreation system for current and future neighborhoods

- Fostering community social interaction
- Protecting natural resources and open space
- Providing the community with efficient recreational services and facilities

The City of St. Joseph currently owns and operates approximately 173 acres of Parkland; however the park classified as region is not developed. The following is an inventory of the City of St. Joseph Park System:

| Classification | # Parks | Acres |
|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| • Citywide Parks | 1 | 4.89 |
| • Community Parks | 3 | 62.34 |
| • Neighborhood Parks | 2 | 9.73 |
| • Neighborhood Playgrounds | 1 | 0.54 |
| • Specialized Recreation | 1 | 0.31 |
| • Regional Park | 1 | 95.08 |

The City considers the East Park as regional due to the access to the public waterway and the ability to provide camping and destination type activities including an interpretive center. The ability to provide a canoe access is a feature that is not readily available in other communities and adds diversity in the park system not only in St. Joseph but Stearns County as well.

Project Timeline

Upon receiving funding, the City will start the project and complete within 12 months.

Other Considerations

When the City first starting discussing the potential parkland with the developer in 2005, Stearns County approached the City and requested the City secure the land adjacent to the river and they would assist the City with the development. They admitted that they do not have funds, but offered the support of the Stearns County Park Department Staff to help plan, develop and secure funds. Stearns County considers this area, as does St. Joseph, a Regional Park that will draw visitors from various destinations to use the park, especially when the camping facilities are developed.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Joseph

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Joseph

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Visitors from various destinations. The Park will be open to the public.

Public Purpose

The proposed development of East Park meets the public purpose as it promotes the following: *

Public Health - promotes a healthy living and active recreation; * Safety - provides a controlled access to the Sauk River* Prosperity - encourages people to use the river adding to the economic prosperity of St. Joseph allowing for additional commercial and residential ventures. * General Welfare - residents/visitors have another opportunity for recreation promoting a healthy lifestyle

Description of Previous Appropriations

n/a

Project Contact Person

Judy Weyrens
Administrator
320-229-9425
jweyrens@cityofstjoseph.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$300,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

East Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$76 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$24 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

St. Louis & Lake Counties RRA

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Northern Lights Express Intercity Passenger Rail | 1 | GO | 31,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 31,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 31,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Northern Lights Express Intercity Passenger Rail

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$31,000**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: The Northern Lights Express (NLX) is a proposed intercity passenger rail service that would operate between Minneapolis and Duluth MN on 152 miles of existing BNSF Railway track at an estimated cost of \$550 million. NLX is positioned to be built incrementally as state and federal funds become available. This project proposes to make railroad infrastructure improvements at two locations: 1.) Grassy Point Bridge, Duluth 2.) BNSF Third Main, Minneapolis.

Project Description

1.) **Grass Point Bridge** is a bridge that will be used for NLX train service that crosses the St. Louis Bay between Duluth MN and Superior WI. The bridge, built in 1912, is a steel truss swing span approximately 1,645 feet in length. The bridge swings open to allow ships to pass through accessing the harbor. At over 100 years old, the bridge requires restorative and preventive maintenance that will bring the bridge back to a state of good repair increasing operating speeds with an overall benefit to existing freight rail service operations and forthcoming NLX passenger rail service.

The NLX project would rehabilitate the bridge operating and control systems and mechanical parts that support the opening and closing of the swing bridge. These improvements will improve the bridge efficiency, safety and allow for increased train speeds.

2.) **BNSF Third Main** is a BNSF mainline track that will be used for the NLX train service located between Target Field Station, Minneapolis and Coon Creek Junction, Coon Rapids. This mainline track is one of the busiest tracks in the country carrying freight traffic along with Northstar commuter rail service and Amtrak's long distance Empire Builder. The existing mainline is currently double tracked, this project will add an additional track or a "Third Main" that will reduce a potential bottleneck once NLX trains are introduced and as freight train volumes increase. The Third Main will reduce the potential for future congestions, increase operating efficiencies and improve reliability of existing and future train operations.

The NLX project would construct a new Third Main track beginning at the north end of BNSF's Northtown yard thence northerly and ending at Coon Creek Junction. The new track would pass immediately west of NorthStar Fridley station allowing NorthStar trains to provide service on each side of the platform and as a place where northbound and southbound trains meet and pass each other in the opposite direction. The Third Main will be located within existing BNSF railroad right-of-way. The end point, Coon Creek Junction, is also the location of a planned station for the NLX project.

Project Rationale

The NLX project will restore intercity passenger rail service between the Twin Cities and the Twin Ports with a new, 21st Century service that utilizes modern technology, modern equipment and quality service. The project provide enhanced freight and passenger train operations, enhanced safety

through improved signaling , enhanced mobility for travelers, enhanced economic development for all communities connected to the system. the system will afford the opportunity to:

Introduce a modern intercity passenger rail system

Introduce passenger rail service to areas of Minnesota that are currently not well served by public transportation.

Introduce an alternative to auto that will result in a positive environmental impact.

Provide major capital investment in rail infrastructure to improve passenger and freight tran efficiency, safety, capacity and reliability.

Provide an impetus for train station developments in communities along the corridor leading to, economic development, growth, travel and tourism.

Project Timeline

Grassy Point Bridge and BNSF Third Main will develop concurrently. BNSF Railway will develop the schedule for this project. A project timeline scenario is as follows:

Predesign: July 2020 through July 2021 - includes agreement(s) with BNSF

Design: July 2021 through May 2022

Construction: May 2022 through December 2022

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Unknown

Who will own the facility?

By agreement, BNSF Railway and State of Minnesota

Who will operate the facility?

By agreement, BNSF Railway and State of Minnesota

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Private freight trains and public passenger trains

Public Purpose

Create new and improve existing public passenger train operations

Description of Previous Appropriations

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Item</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------|
| 2020 | Feasibility Study | \$75,000 |
| 2009 | Environmental Study | \$900,000 |
| 2009 | Dot Staff | \$125,000 |
| 2009 | Third Main Design | \$800,000 |
| 2011 | Survey | \$300,000 |
| 2012 | PE & NEPA | \$3,000,000 |
| Total | | \$5,200,000 |

Project Contact Person

Robert Manzoline
Executive Director
218-744-2653
bmanzoline@rrauth.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Northern Lights Express Intercity Passenger Rail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$31,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$46,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$77,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$15,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$62,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$77,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | N/A |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center | 1 | GO | 8,250 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Clarity Behavioral Health Crisis Facility | 2 | GO | 1,365 | 0 | 0 | 1,365 | 0 | 0 |
| Voyageur Country ATV Trail System Expansion | 3 | GO | 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Louis County Fairground Buildings | 4 | GO | 400 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 11,015 | 0 | 0 | 2,765 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 11,015 | 0 | 0 | 2,765 | 0 | 0 |

St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$8,250

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$8.25 million in state funds is requested to match local contributions of \$4.25 million and an estimated \$2 million of in-kind contributions for critical investment in building asset preservation, exhibit build-out and train shed expansion at the St Louis County Heritage and Arts Center (the Depot) to accommodate vintage luxury rail cars and train model set.

Project Description

The St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center (the Depot) is a 112,758 square foot multi-use building that is owned by St. Louis County and is leased to non-profit organizations that support the vibrancy of arts, history, and culture in the northern region of the state. The funding would:

- address critical life safety issues;
- establish a basis of design for the HVAC/MEP improvements;
- provide an Energy Modeling/Energy Audit that will provide the best return on investment (ROI) design for these long life cycle systems renewal (wall, roof and windows); and
- accommodate a large train model set (donated by the Seacrest family) and vintage luxury rail cars to enable the St. Louis Heritage and Arts Center to build upon its current offerings and potentially generate an additional revenue stream.

This asset preservation and construction project preserves the integrity of the structure and creates a potential new revenue stream that could contribute to ongoing capital needs to preserve this historic building—which was placed on the State Register of Historic Places in 1969 pursuant to Laws of Minnesota 1969, chapter 894, section 6, and confirmed in 1993 pursuant to Laws of Minnesota 1993, chapter 181, sections 4 and 13; in 1971, the building was placed on the national register of historic places. Funding sources would include St. Louis County funds, Lake Superior Railroad Museum funds, in-kind contributions (of an estimated \$2 million) and State funds (upon award).

Project Rationale

The Depot was placed on the national register of historic places in 1971. St. Louis County has an obligation to protect this significant historic and cultural resource (as per M.S. Sec. 138.666, M.S. Sec. 138.665, and M.S. Sec. 138.40). It is the County’s intention to preserve the integrity of the structure, prevent the need for demolition, and provide an opportunity to increase the building’s vitality and generate revenue to help bring sustainability to the St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center. During the predesign and design processes, the functionality, aesthetics, space needs, energy conservation measures, building code requirements, upgraded system needs, and other factors will be considered to extend the useful life of the facility.

Project Timeline

Predesign/design work by architects and engineers will be initiated in 2020 following award of state general obligation bond funding and completion of grant agreement. When design work is completed

in 2021, construction bids will be solicited with construction anticipated to occur in 2021 and 2022.

Other Considerations

The St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center (the Depot) is home to organizations that support the arts, history, and culture. Exhibiting organizations—the Lake Superior Railroad Museum, St. Louis County Historical Society, and Duluth Art Institute—display collections of artifacts and artwork. The North Shore Scenic Railroad is a seasonal scenic railroad that boards at the Depot, and its ticket office is adjacent to the train museum. Performing arts organizations benefit from being housed in The Depot. The Duluth Playhouse is the local community theater company and has both a Family Theatre Stage and an Underground theater in the building. The Minnesota Ballet has the School of the MN Ballet classes in their Depot Studios on the lower level. And the Arrowhead Chorale and Matinee Musicale have some office space at the Depot and host performances in the Great Hall. These organizations attract hundreds of thousands of visitors from the surrounding area and beyond, resulting in positive economic impact for the City of Duluth and St. Louis County. The addition of the model train (which depicts the Duluth, Winnipeg and Pacific Railroad) and executive railcars will enable the Depot to draw new audiences and enhance its position as a destination point in St. Louis County and bringing in additional tourism dollars to support northeastern Minnesota.

The St. Louis County Heritage & Arts Center (the Depot) is also home to Veterans Memorial Hall, which is a joint program of the St. Louis County Historical Society and the United States Military service veterans of northeastern Minnesota—with a mission to gather, preserve, interpret, and promote the rich and diverse human experiences of veterans, their families, and communities through museum, archival, and educational programs. (<http://www.vets-hall.org/about-museum>)

The St. Louis County Board, at its 2018 organizational meeting, established a Depot subcommittee, consisting of representation from the County Board, and staff of both St. Louis County and the City of Duluth, to review the operations of the St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center (the Depot). The goal of the subcommittee was to identify a model that can be implemented to assist with the future operation and long term success of the facility. In 2019, the St. Louis County Board approved the hiring of a county employee as director of the St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center. The director will be responsible for the overall administration of the Depot by exercising strategic leadership, developing collaborative partnerships, and guiding program and policy development necessary to build a sustaining, vibrant, high-valued arts, cultural and heritage center attraction.

The St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center (the Depot) is one of the planned stations for the Northern Lights Express (NLX)—the proposed high-speed intercity passenger rail project that would provide service between Minneapolis and Duluth. The Depot would support NLX's goal of fiscal growth, economic development, job growth and increased tourism revenue.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None anticipated.

Who will own the facility?

St. Louis County

Who will operate the facility?

St. Louis County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Lake Superior Railroad Museum, The North Shore Scenic Railroad, St. Louis County Historical

Society, Duluth Art Institute, Duluth Playhouse, Minnesota Ballet, Arrowhead Chorale, Matinee Musicale and/or other non-profit organizations and the general public

Public Purpose

The St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center (the Depot) is on the national register of historic places and serves as a hub of cultural, arts and heritage activities. Its mix of performing arts organizations and exhibiting organizations attracts people from all over the state of Minnesota and beyond to enjoy what the northern part of the state has to offer with regard to the arts, history, and culture. A portion of the City of Duluth’s tourism tax dollars supports the Depot, illustrating the impact the facility and its tenants have on the health of the economy and the vibrancy of the community.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None for this project.

Project Contact Person

Peter Miller
Capital Planning Manager
218-726-2357
millerp@stlouiscountymn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

St. Louis County Heritage and Arts Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$8,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$3,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$12,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,520 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$80 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$520 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$12,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Clarity Behavioral Health Crisis Facility**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,365**Priority Ranking:** 2

Project Summary: This regional crisis center will connect people to services such as mental health triage, peer support, assessments for substance use disorder, gap medication appointments, medical assistance access and question answering, treatment referrals and other related services. People needing immediate support are often directed to multiple agencies; this center would be a single place to offer a wide variety of needed services with support to access what is needed at the time.

Project Description

Provide a facility for people needing support to access services. The Clarity Behavioral Health Crisis Center is a regional facility resulting from the collaboration of the county, Essentia Health, St. Luke's, law enforcement, community mental health providers, courts, jail and other community providers.

Project Rationale

Minnesota Department of Human Services, Behavioral Health Division issued a request for proposals for qualified grantees for construction or rehabilitation of behavioral health crisis facilities on September 17, 2018. St. Louis County and its regional collaborators from the healthcare community were awarded a grant of \$3,634,923 to proceed with the project. However, this was \$1,365,077 less than the amount requested. The county is unable to proceed until the shortfall in funding has been addressed.

Project Timeline

If state funding of an additional \$1,365,077 is granted in May/June 2020, then design will be completed by early 2021 and the facility constructed by the end of 2021.

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

None anticipated.

Who will own the facility?

St. Louis County

Who will operate the facility?

St. Louis County with partners/members of the regional healthcare community.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Partners/members of the regional healthcare community.

Public Purpose

Address the need for regional behavioral crisis centers as identified by the Minnesota legislature and requested by the Department of Human Services, Behavioral Health Division on September 17, 2018.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Minnesota Department of Human Services, Behavioral Health Division issued a request for proposals for qualified grantees for construction or rehabilitation of behavioral health crisis facilities on September 17, 2018. St. Louis County and its regional collaborators from the healthcare community were awarded a grant of \$3,634,923 to proceed with the project. This grant has not yet been accepted by the county pending identification of full funding for the project.

Project Contact Person

Pete Miller
Capital Planning Manager
218-726-2357
millerp@stlouiscountymn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.365 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Clarity Behavioral Health Crisis Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,365 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$3,635 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$450 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Voyageur Country ATV Trail System Expansion**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,000**Priority Ranking:** 3**Project Summary:** St. Louis County, on behalf of Voyageur Country ATV Incorporated, is requesting \$1 million dollars for the expansion and construction of an ATV multi-use trail located in northeastern Minnesota.**Project Description**

St. Louis County, on behalf of Voyageur Country ATV Incorporated, is requesting \$1,000,000 for the expansion and construction of an ATV/Multi-use Trail that will connect with existing and planned trails and communities throughout northeast MN. The estimated cost for the overall project is \$2,000,000. The ATV Club is currently working on matching funds through Federal, Private and Local sources. The trail will be constructed to connect with the Blue Ox Trail near International Falls, will continue through the Kabetogama/Ash River/Orr area and will eventually connect with the Quad Cities Trail near Cook and the Prospector's Trail near Tower, Ely and the Lake County/North Shore area.

The trail will be constructed on existing roads and lands owned by St. Louis County, Koochiching County, the U.S. Forest Service, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR), area townships and private entities. The trail will be constructed by environmentally sound practices and will include overlook areas and bridges over scenic rivers and streams. This connection trail will enable users to use all of the existing trails in the region without the having to constantly load, unload and trailer vehicles.

The club has met and garnered support from the U.S. Forest Service, MN DNR, area townships and cities, St. Louis County and other area ATV clubs. The Club has received \$2.7 million dollars in grants through state, federal and local entities to design the alignment of Phase I and preliminary alignment of Phase II, completion of wetland delineation and permitting, design for a bridge over the Vermilion River and to complete an overall master plan for the Voyageur trail system.

Project Rationale

The completion of this project will improve safety on well-designed trails, will help to protect the environment by keeping riders on trails as opposed to off-trail riding, will provide a family-friendly outdoor activity and will increase tourism activity which will create jobs and expand the region's economic base.

Project Timeline

July 2020 through June 2024

Other Considerations

The desired result is to provide safe responsible riding opportunities for visiting families, to connect the many logging trails and corridor routes, to promote economic growth opportunities for local businesses, and for local neighbors to enjoy the beautiful forested lands surrounding our

communities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Voyageur Country ATV Incorporated will be responsible for all future operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

St. Louis County, Koochiching County, and State of Minnesota

Who will operate the facility?

Voyageur Country ATV Incorporated

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public

Public Purpose

The completion of this project will provide recreational opportunities and economic development by connecting the communities in the northeastern region of Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Jim Foldesi
Public Works Director
218-625-3840
foldesij@stlouiscountymn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Voyageur Country ATV Trail System Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

St. Louis County Fairground Buildings

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$400

Priority Ranking: 4

Project Summary: St. Louis County, on behalf of the St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association, is requesting \$400 thousand dollars for the construction of two buildings at the St. Louis County Fairgrounds in Chisholm, Minnesota.

Project Description

St. Louis County, on behalf of the St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association, is requesting \$400 thousand dollars for the construction of one building for cattle, sheep, goats and swine, and one building for rabbit and poultry exhibits. St. Louis County will match \$400 thousand for this project.

The St. Louis County Fair is a 135-year-old event that has been held in Chisholm for the past 20 years. It is one of the ten largest County fairs in the state of Minnesota and is referenced as the “Five Best Days of Summer.”

The Fair is proposing to build a 60x200 cattle barn and a 60x100 rabbit and small animal building. Currently, the Fair rents tents to house these exhibits, which is costly—forcing the Fair to use a large portion of its annual funding to pay for these annual expenses. Building permanent structures would allow the Fair to offer a better way for fairgoers to view and interact with the animals—providing a more positive hands-on learning experience.

Project Rationale

The completion of this project will enable the St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association to continue to offer educational opportunities through its animal exhibits—enabling over 20,000 annual visitors to learn the importance and impact of agriculture in everyday life. Permanent structures would not only create a more comfortable environment for the animals, but also improve the safety for both animals and fairgoers.

Project Timeline

Assuming project funding is approved in June 2020, we would expect project initiation in July/August 2020 and completion by December 2020.

Other Considerations

The St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association supports agriculture education for both members of 4-H and the general public. The last few years, the St. Louis County Fair has been experiencing an increase in animal exhibitors. Having newer, more permanent exhibit buildings that met the needs of the animals and fairgoers would enable the Fair to accommodate larger number of animals and visitors. Increases in attendance further support local vendors at the Fair—providing them with more exposure, which could potentially lead to more economic growth in northeastern Minnesota.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association will be responsible for all future operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association

Who will operate the facility?

St. Louis County Agricultural Fair Association

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General public

Public Purpose

The completion of this project will provide educational opportunities to St. Louis County Fair visitors from the northeastern region of Minnesota and beyond.

Description of Previous Appropriations**Project Contact Person**

Pete Miller
Capital Planning Manager
218-726-2357
millerp@stlouiscountymn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$400,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

St. Louis County Fairground Buildings

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Seed the Change - Perspectives Capital Improvements | 1 | GO | 4,900 | 0 | 0 | 4,900 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,900 | 0 | 0 | 4,900 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,900 | 0 | 0 | 4,900 | 0 | 0 |

Seed the Change - Perspectives Capital Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$4,900

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: This Perspectives request for the 2020 Capital Investment Bill of \$4.9 million is needed to finish the Seed the Change Capital Project by constructing, furnishing, and equipping the Perspectives Family Center, located at 3381 Gorham Avenue, St. Louis Park, MN

Project Description

Seed the Change Capital Campaign for Perspectives will completely renovate the existing 22,000 square foot Family Center and expand the Perspectives Family Center by an additional 16,000 square feet. The newly renovated and expanded 38,000 square foot facility will include: four new Early Childhood Education classrooms; new & expanded therapy and group rooms for Outpatient Co-occurring Treatment and Children’s Mental Health; Kids Cafe dining room expansion; safe, fenced playgrounds and additional green space, expanded space for Kids Connection Programming; updated secure reception area, new multi-purpose/media room; and new parking lot.

This capital campaign has a goal of over \$13 million. The Campaign has secured more than \$3.3 million to date, with more than \$1.6 million from Foundations/Corporations, \$902,000 secured from individual donors, and \$800,000 from government. Critical to this project was securing \$600,000 through the 2017 MN Legislature Bonding Bill for project pre-design/design, which is 90% complete. Currently over \$4 million in funding hinges on Perspectives securing a 2020 bonding bill.

Project Rationale

The Seed the Change Capital Campaign was launched for the purpose of renovating a 60-year-old office building into a vibrant family center. Perspectives purchased the 22,000-sq.-ft. building in 1996 and, over time, has reconfigured it in order to provide comprehensive services to homeless/at risk families and children. Today, despite costly repairs, the building continues to deteriorate; additionally, the space is at capacity. There is also an urgent need to provide security and handicap accessibility, which the current building does not have.

Additionally, the funding will provide for expansion and enhancement for four key programs: 1. Clinical Services - providing onsite diagnostic assessments, treatment planning, screening, referrals and individual, family and/or group psychotherapy, led by an integrated team of mental health and chemical health professionals. 2. Children's Mental Health - therapists provide assessments, treatment plans and both one-on-one and family counseling to assist children in their healing process. 3. Kids Connection - a year-round, comprehensive, extended-day academic program. 4. Kids Cafe - a nutritional and culinary program.

The project will expand the Center’s footprint to develop and implement a multicultural, trauma-informed early childhood development program, called Day One. This program will provide preschool education and therapy to children who have already experienced extensive trauma in their lives. Day One will give at-risk children the foundation they need to be successful when they enter kindergarten.

Ultimately, the project will enable Perspectives to sustain programs and services for decades to come.

Project Timeline

CONSTRUCTION:

Construction Bids sought - June/July 2020
Contractor selection - September 2020
Contractor Agreements completed - February 2021
Construction begins - April 2021
Building Addition completed - August 2021
Building renovations completed - February 2022
Project Completed - March 2022

Other Considerations

Perspectives mission of breaking cycles for future generations provides intervention services to address the devastating effects that homelessness, poverty and the exposure to addiction, mental illness, and abuse have on young children.

The state's investment of \$600,000 in 2017 for pre-design/design has brought the project through land acquisition, pre-design, engineering, and environmental testing phases. This project is ready to finalize funding, secure contractor/construction agreements and begin construction as soon as April 2021.

Perspectives' strong public - private partnership makes it possible to address their mission. Providing \$4.9 million through this bonding request will enable Perspectives to expand, and enhance the services provided to homeless mothers and children at the Family Center; however, it is the children who will feel the greatest impact.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Perspectives will own the land and facility and will lease the land and facility to the City of St. Louis Park via a ground lease for a period equal to 125% of the useful life of the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Perspectives, Inc. - a nationally recognized non-profit human service agency. Perspectives will operate the facility under a lease/use agreement with the City of St. Louis Park for a period not to exceed 50% of the useful life of the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will serve dual-diagnosed, previously homeless mothers and their children, as well as economically disadvantaged children within the community, Grades K-8, who are on the free/reduced lunch program. The facility will also serve preschool children living in poverty who have been traumatized through homelessness, addiction, and abuse.

Public Purpose

This project will benefit the broader Minnesota community and will save millions of dollars in deep-end

services that would be needed by the women and their children served by Perspectives' programs, including support for their addiction recovery, mental health treatment, life skills, permanent housing transition and employment support. Their children receive therapeutic and supportive services to increase their opportunity for success in both school and life.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Perspectives was granted \$600,000 in the 2017 Capital Investment Bill, which the Governor signed on May 30, 2017. Subsequently, the Perspectives match, as well as the pre-design and design budget, were approved by MMB. The grant paid for the Architect, Civil Engineering, Interior Design, Survey, and Environmental/Soil Testing services, as well as Watershed Site Plan application fees, permits, and the General Contractor. The acquisition of property, parking lot construction and Pre-Design work is completed, allowing the Project to be "shovel-ready" in 2020.

Project Contact Person

Karen Barton
Community Development Director
952-924-2684
kbarton@stlouispark.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$4.9 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Seed the Change - Perspectives Capital Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$138 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$16 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$1,098 | \$1,271 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$4,927 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,286 | \$11,714 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$43 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$39 | \$116 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$394 | \$2,330 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$382 | \$8,156 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$128 | \$512 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,286 | \$11,714 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | Yes |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| CR 12 Utility and Sidewalk Improvements | 1 | GO | 1,158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,158 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

CR 12 Utility and Sidewalk Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$1,158

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$1,158,000 in state funds is requested for predesign, design and construction of a replacement water distribution, sanitary sewer collection system, storm water treatment and sidewalk improvements that are required due to Stearns County reconstructing CSAH 12 in the city limits. The county is replacing the roadway in 2020 and the city owned sewer and water is deteriorating and needs to be replaced at the same time as the street is reconstructed.

Project Description

The project will include the removal and replacement the severely deteriorating sewer and water piping within the county roadway which is also the main street of St. Martin. This work must be done concurrently with the roadway construction to minimize future excavation in the new roadway. The project will include the removal and replacement of 2028 feet of gravity sewer collection piping, 1941 feet of sewer forcemain, 7 manholes and 627 feet of sewer service piping. The water distribution piping work will include the removal of 2766 feet of pipe and replacement with an additional 1825 feet of new watermain to provide adequate fire protection in the downtown area. In addition, 12 new fire hydrants will be placed as part of the project. Stormwater treatment improvements will be completed where none currently exist and sidewalk will be replaced at city expense in accordance with the county cost sharing policy.

The estimated cost for the project is \$1,158,000 which includes preliminary and final design, construction costs and construction engineering.

Project Rationale

County State Aid Highway 12 (Maine Street) requires a full reconstruction including curb & gutter and bituminous surfacing storm sewer improvements and sidewalk replacement. The city utilities locate beneath the roadway are in deteriorating condition and are likely to have significant failures in the near future. If the utilities are not replaced at this time the newly constructed roadway would have to be cut into to repair any sewer collapse or watermain breaks at a significant cost to the city and to the detriment of the newly constructed roadway which would not be reconstructed again for approximately 40-50 years. The city has recently completed the construction of a drinking water well and water treatment plant at a cost of \$2,034,689 and a wastewater treatment at a cost of \$1,667,000. The addition burden of this project will severe on the tax burden of the community.

Project Timeline

- Preliminary Design: Completed
- Final Design: August 2019- December 2019
- Bidding: January 2020
- Construction: June 2020 – July 2021

The design and construction of the St. Martin sewer and water system will be bid as part of the Stearns County CSAH 12 project and schedules coordinated to allow for optimal bidding.

Other Considerations

The city has just completed a water well and treatment plant project and a sanitary sewer rehabilitation and new treatment system for a total cost of \$3,701,700. The city was not anticipating the need to replace these utilities and sidewalk for several years, however the condition of the roadway is deteriorating and in need of reconstruction. The cost sharing policy of the County is creating a financial hardship for the city.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The bonding request will reduce the City of St. Martins annual debt service for this project by \$73,800 per year assuming a 20-year bond at 3.25% would be required to pay for this project.

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Martin

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. Martin

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of St. Martin

Public Purpose

The sewer and water systems will serve the residents and businesses of the City. The storm sewer system will treat the runoff from both City and County Roadways. The sidewalk will serve the general public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Wyatt Kemper
City Clerk
320-548-3569
citystmartin@meltel.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

CR 12 Utility and Sidewalk Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,158 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,158 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$128 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$967 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$63 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,158 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | |
| Is the required information included in this request? | |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|--------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Third Street Kellogg Boulevard Bridge | 1 | GO | 55,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EastBound Kellogg Boulevard RiverCentre Bridge | 2 | GO | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center | 3 | GO | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Como Park Zoo | 4 | GO | 2,500 | 13,500 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 |
| International Institute | | GO | 5,500 | 0 | 0 | 5,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Minnesota Humanities Center | | GO | 750 | 0 | 0 | 750 | 0 | 0 |
| Playwrights' Center | | GO | 1,100 | 2,900 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Victoria Theater Arts | | GO | 2,400 | 0 | 0 | 2,400 | 0 | 0 |
| YMCA | | GO | 1,600 | 8,400 | 0 | 1,600 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 81,850 | 24,800 | 0 | 15,750 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 81,850 | 24,800 | 0 | 15,750 | 0 | 0 |

Third Street Kellogg Boulevard Bridge**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$55,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$55 million is requested for the replacement of the Third Street Kellogg Blvd bridge which has been declared structurally deficient and provides a critical artery between a concentrated area of poverty and the resources available in downtown Saint Paul.**Project Description**

The heart of downtown Saint Paul sits on a bluff overlooking the Mississippi River and slopes downward to Lowertown, the historic warehouse district along the river where Union Depot, dozens of railroad tracks, and old brick buildings have been transformed to lofts, artists' studios, and office space. One-half mile northeast on a bluff overlooking downtown and the river sit the East Side neighborhoods of Dayton's Bluff and Payne/Phalen, both of which are evolving into vibrant, culturally diverse communities. The Third Street Kellogg Blvd Bridge is one of only two connections between downtown and Saint Paul's East Side and crosses the low land near the Mississippi River, Burlington Northern Santa Fe (B.N.S.F.) railway track, the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary and Regional Trail, and six lanes of Interstate 94.

The bridge is approximately 0.4 miles long and before it was restricted in 2014, carried two general purpose lanes and a ten-foot sidewalk on the south side. The September 2014 annual average daily traffic (A.A.D.T.) count (conducted on the bridge and just prior to its restrictions) was 14,400-vehicles per day.

After signs of stress were found on the bridge piers during routine inspections, the City of Saint Paul (City) began supplementing regular inspections with increased monitoring, specialized inspection, and load-capacity analysis. In 2014, the City was forced to close the outer lanes of the bridge because the piers that support them were deemed structurally insufficient. However, the inside lanes are fully supported by beams that transfer stresses directly to the columns and not to the cantilevers. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), outside consultants, and City engineers confirmed that continued operation on the inner lanes of the bridge is safe. Since then, traffic on the bridge has been restricted to the three innermost lanes of the bridge, with a narrow six-foot lane shared by bicycles and pedestrians. While operations on the center lanes are structurally safe, the outer lanes and sidewalk are unusable, and the shoulders and the shared bicycle and pedestrian lane are substandard in the reconfiguration. The reduced shoulder width also causes storage of plowed snow to encroach into the vehicular lanes, effectively reducing the lane width until snow removal can be completed.

On its east end, the Third Street Kellogg Blvd Bridge intersects with Mounds Boulevard, a major thoroughfare through Dayton's Bluff that provides access to eastbound I-94 and distributes traffic exiting the westbound freeway. Kellogg Boulevard becomes 3rd Street, a regular part of the neighborhood street network in Dayton's Bluff, serving mostly residential uses with some

neighborhood commercial establishments. On its west end in Lowertown and the downtown core, Kellogg Boulevard is a main thoroughfare that serves Union Depot, offices, shops, restaurants, hotels, museums, and civic spaces in Saint Paul's central business district.

The Third Street Kellogg Blvd Bridge is heavily used by bus commuters from points north and east. Local Routes 63 and 70, which service the Dayton's Bluff and the Sunray/Battle Creek/Highwood neighborhoods, use the bridge as do limited stop Route 350 and express Routes 294, 351, 353, 361, and 364 which bring commuters from the Saint Paul suburbs of Maplewood, Oakdale, Woodbury, Saint Paul Park, Cottage Grove, and Stillwater to downtown Saint Paul. These routes connect to the Green Line LRT, Amtrak, and intercity bus services at Union Depot. Because of the topography of the area, closure of the Kellogg/3rd Street Bridge would mean significant detours for these bus routes and delay for more than 4,000 passengers each day.

In addition to current bus routes, Gold Line BRT will use the bridge. Gold Line BRT is a proposed transit-way connecting downtown Saint Paul with its East Side neighborhoods and the suburbs of Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale, Lake Elmo, and Woodbury. Gold Line BRT will operate all day bi-directional service every fifteen minutes or more often. Stations are proposed at the west end of the Kellogg/3rd Street Bridge at Union Depot and at the east end of the bridge at Mounds Boulevard or Maria Avenue.

Another transit way corridor, the Rush Line, is in its early stages of planning. While a mode of transit and a route have not yet been selected, several Rush Line alignment options would use the Third Street Kellogg Blvd Bridge to connect to Union Depot. The poor condition of the bridge limits current and future transit system improvements, a situation that is untenable given its proximity to Union Depot.

Third Street Kellogg Boulevard is a ten-ton truck route in the City's freight network. Since the bridge was restricted, the City has placed a "legal load only" restriction on the bridge. No permits will be issued to trucks hauling more than the legal limit. Current lane closures on the bridge create frequent bottlenecks for goods movement.

Project Rationale

The Third Street Kellogg Boulevard Bridge has been declared structurally deficient and must be replaced because of two major issues:

1. The bridge's substructure is compromised because the joints of the bridge, which allow it to expand and contract with the major temperature range present in Minnesota, are cracked from use. The cracked joints allow storm water and melted ice and snow, which often carry heavy concentrations of road salt, to drip onto the piers below. The salty water becomes trapped in the concrete piers and corrodes the rebar within. Corrosion causes the rebar to expand, cracking and loosening the concrete around it. Once the concrete begins to fall off of the piers and the rebar is exposed, the piers deteriorate rapidly.
2. The Third Street Kellogg Boulevard Bridge was built in 1982, just as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) updated the design code for bridge cantilevers. The cantilevers on the bridge were designed according to old, now obsolete code and are now cracked. This cracking combined with the deterioration of the piers makes the bridge unable to support any weight in its outer lanes.

The proposed project will replace the structurally deficient bridge with a new bridge that includes four vehicular lanes (Bus Rapid-Transit will also operate within these lanes), and twelve-foot bike and pedestrian lanes in each direction.

Project Timeline

- Project bid date late 2020
- Project commence late 2020/early 2021
- Open to traffic fall 2022
- Project completion June 2023

Other Considerations

In the part of Dayton's Bluff closest to the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge, thirty-six percent of households do not own a car. In downtown, twenty-one to twenty-eight percent of households are without a car. The number of households without cars in the East Side neighborhoods and downtown are among the highest in the Twin Cities. This bridge is critical as a multimodal thoroughfare and in its current condition, it does not provide an adequate, safe connection.

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge connects the neighborhoods of East Side Saint Paul to Lowertown and downtown Saint Paul, the regional's second largest job center with more than 65,000 jobs. Downtown Saint Paul is home to several hospitals, major finance, insurance, healthcare and engineering firms, hosts a growing technology sector, and a major hospitality industry with most of Saint Paul's hotels, and hundreds of restaurants. On the eastern side of downtown, the Warehouse District of Lowertown has seen enormous growth as more than 3.5 million square feet of abandoned industrial warehouses have been renovated and converted to offices, apartments, condos, galleries, and retail space. Unlike many similar warehouse artist neighborhoods across the country that transitioned quickly from artists' neighborhoods to gentrified neighborhoods, Lowertown has held onto its working/living artists through several artist cooperatives that offer affordable live-work spaces. The creative community continues to grow with designers, architects, musicians, programmers, and actors joining traditional media artists.

Several major investments in Lowertown have built on its creative enterprises to make the neighborhood a regional destination; relocation of the Saint Paul Farmers' Market in 1982 to Lowertown (a facility that serves as an opportunity for Hmong farmers, many of whom live on the East Side, to build wealth), renovation of the historic Union Depot completed in 2012, the opening of the Green Line LRT between downtown Minneapolis and downtown Saint Paul in 2014 using Federal Transit Administration New Starts Funds, and finally, completion of the Saint Paul Saints Baseball Park in 2015.

The East Side is a developing job center in its own right, with several major redevelopment initiatives completed or underway to reinstate the nearly 5,000 jobs that left the East Side beginning in the 1970s when 3M, Whirlpool, and Hamm's Brewing all relocated their facilities elsewhere. Redevelopment initiatives have been led by small businesses, many of them minority-owned and oriented toward serving and employing East Side residents. As discussed previously, the topographical change between downtown Saint Paul and the East Side is limited to bridges on Kellogg Boulevard and East 7th Street. Therefore, it is essential for continued economic growth that both conduits remain open and fully functional.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will use or occupy the facility?

General Public

Public Purpose

Public bridge for public use.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Paul Kurtz
City Engineer
651-266-6203
paul.kurtz@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

Third Street Kellogg Boulevard Bridge

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$55,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$300 | \$7,903 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$2,312 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$300 | \$65,215 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$3,195 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$8,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$53,820 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$300 | \$65,215 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

EastBound Kellogg Boulevard RiverCentre Bridge

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$10,000**Priority Ranking:** 2

Project Summary: \$10 million in state bond funds is requested to design and construct a replacement bridge for the existing EB Kellogg Boulevard Bridge No. 90378 at the City of Saint Paul RiverCentre. This project will replace existing Kellogg Boulevard bridge structure, Eagle Street viaduct and associated Kellogg Boulevard approach roadways. These structures have reached the end of their useful design life and must be replaced. Bridge No. 90378 is considered structurally deficient.

Project Description

- The total request of the State is for bonding in the amount of \$10 million, allowing for reconstruction and rehabilitation of eastbound Kellogg Boulevard retaining walls, approach roadways, the Exchange Street viaduct (MSAS 258), and Bridge No. 90378 over river bluff ravine. The total construction cost for both parts of the project is \$22.77 million.
- This request for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of eastbound Kellogg Boulevard includes retaining walls, approach roadways, the Exchange Street viaduct (MSAS 258), and Bridge No. 90378 over the river bluff ravine. The project limits are MSAS 158 (Kellogg Boulevard) between West 7th Street and Market Street. The total project length is 1,800 feet, with a reconstructed bridge length of approximately 1,040 feet.
- This project is directly adjacent to the River Centre parking ramp on the south side of Kellogg Boulevard and the RiverCentre on the north side of Kellogg Boulevard.
- The replacement of eastbound Kellogg Boulevard, Exchange Street viaduct and eastbound Kellogg Boulevard Bridge No. 90378, achieves the majority of goals identified in the 2040 MnDOT TPP. Kellogg Boulevard reconstruction/restoration (including Bridge No. 90378 and Exchange Street Viaduct) restores serviceability and enables cost-effective maintenance over a 75-to-110 year design life.

Project Rationale

- The existing Bridge is a 39 span, 1,040 foot eastbound structure constructed in 1936. Three spans were rehabilitated in 1995. The bridge has a sufficiency rating of 46.8 in the most recent MnDOT structural inventory report, is structurally deficient, and after 83 years has reached the end of its useful design life. Kellogg Boulevard is a four-lane roadway with existing eastbound bridge no. 90378 carrying the two eastbound Kellogg Boulevard vehicular lanes, shoulder, and a pedestrian sidewalk. The bridge also incorporates the crossover areas to the westbound bridge and structural accommodations for the viaduct providing vehicular access from Kellogg Boulevard to the lower bluff area. Kellogg Boulevard (MSA158) in the project area is classified as an A-Minor Arterial with Average Daily traffic of 17,300 (5% of that traffic being heavy truck traffic).

- This project provides opportunities to improve accessibility and multi-modal access in established entertainment and downtown districts. Kellogg Boulevard is a popular 10-ton truck route (despite its permit truck load restriction status) along the southern edge of the downtown district, paralleling 7th Street to the north. Freight use includes both commercial deliveries with downtown destinations, as well as downtown truck transit. Kellogg Boulevard is well connected from I-35E to Lowertown/East Side/I-94 and also intersects with river crossings at Wabasha and Robert Streets to access West Saint Paul, Highway 52, and southern cities.
- Capacity to accommodate freight and other heavy trucks would be improved through reconstruction. Kellogg Boulevard provides access between the project area and Interstate Highways 35E and 94, as well as State highway 5 to the west and State highway 52 south of the downtown area, thus serving as a vital transportation link for commuters and regional residents.
- This project sustains the commercial importance of Kellogg Boulevard, which is a critical trucking/business delivery corridor central to the vitality of the downtown area. The RiverCentre is used extensively by downtown workers during the day, and by visitors to the nearby regional attractions during the evenings. The success of both the Xcel Energy Center and the RiverCenter convention facility is directly dependent on the access provided by Kellogg Boulevard, bridge and viaduct. Kellogg Boulevard in the project area serves as the main entry point for the RiverCentre Parking Ramp.

Project Timeline

Anticipated project timeline is as follows:

Begin construction: Fall 2020

Bridge open to traffic: Fall 2022

Complete project: Summer 2023

Other Considerations

The project must be fully funded, design complete, and project authorization met by June 30, 2021 in order to retain the state bridge bonds and federal solicitation grant funds associated with the project, which total \$8.75M.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Residents and visitors to the City of Saint Paul.

Public Purpose

Open to the public to use.

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Glenn Pagel
City Bridge Engineer
651-266-6187
glenn.pagel@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

EastBound Kellogg Boulevard RiverCentre Bridge

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$1,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$4,020 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$22,770 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,120 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$1,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$19,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$22,770 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$3,000 |
| Priority Ranking: | 3 |
| Project Summary: | \$3 million in state bonds is requested for design and permitting for the River Recreation and Environmental Education Center. |

Project Description

This 2020 request is for \$3 million in state bond funding for designing and permitting for a new River Recreation and Environmental Education Center located in the City of Saint Paul, Ramsey County. The intent of the center is to provide the general public greater access to the Mississippi River and new opportunities for river and nature related recreational experience, environmental education and stewardship currently unavailable to Saint Paul’s and the region’s inner city youth, residents and visitors alike.

This project is one of several projects now under various stages of planning, funding and development along the City of Saint Paul’s 17 mile stretch of the Mississippi River, recently renamed the Great River Passage, www.greatriverpassage.org. Over the past 30 years, millions of dollars in local, state and federal funding have been invested in the 3,500 acres of Regional Parks along Saint Paul’s 17 mile Mississippi River waterfront. These parks have included Upper Landing Park and Chestnut Plaza, and regional parks Harriet Island, Raspberry Island, Indian Mounds Regional Park, Lilydale Regional Park, Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary, and the Bruce Vento and Sam Morgan Regional Trails. These park projects enhance the value of adjacent residential property, help stimulate the local and state economy through new job creation, protect our environment, promote health and wellness, and provide nature based recreation to under-represented populations including people of color, physically challenged and economically disadvantaged persons.

Project Rationale

The project is important to both Saint Paul, The River Capital, and Minnesota, The Headwaters State, and will:

- Create the next generation of park users and river stewards
- Transform what is now a strategic but underutilized, isolated edge of Saint Paul to an accessible regional center of activity
- Leverage the Mississippi River, the naturalized urban location, and public and private partnerships to stimulate economic development and act as a catalyst for future strategic development to improve quality of life for the community and health of the river

Project benefits include:

ECONOMIC

Create jobs in design, construction, maintenance and operations, education, recreation, food, and marine services. Develop strategic partnerships for revenue-generating opportunities and cost sharing. Leverage public dollars for private investment.

HEALTH AND WELLNESS

Develop year-round environmental, cultural and historical education and recreation opportunities that are integrated into the community and region's routines, traditions and collective identity. Cultivate a constituency that values the river and will care for it in the future.

IDENTITY

Minnesota's identity and well-being is inextricably linked to the Mississippi River. The River Learning Center is an opportunity to build on the history and interconnectedness to the river, create an authentic, signature destination that positions the state nationally and internationally, improve the quality of life for residents and visitors, and cultivate a constituency that values the river and will care for it into the future.

Project Timeline

PROJECT TIMELINE and DELIVERABLES: JULY 2020–MARCH 2021 Schematic Design• Vision• Phasing• Cost estimate APRIL–DECEMBER 2021 Design Development – Construction Documents• Construction Documents• Cooperative Management Agreement• Funding strategy• Environmental assessment• Permitting APRIL 2022 – MAY 2023 Construction, Furnish and Equip

Other Considerations

The current Watergate Marina, located within the Valley Reach of the Great River Passage, will be rebuilt as a new River Recreation and Environmental Education Center, to accommodate more river-oriented uses and activities. It will become a hub for nature-based recreational activity; a place where you can rent a canoe or kayak, fishing equipment, bicycles, cross country skis and snowshoes, or have lunch along the river's edge at the new café; making this destination a year round activity center promoting a healthy, nature-based, active lifestyle. Environmental stewardship will be encouraged through classes and outdoor experiences.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of Saint Paul Parks and Recreation Department

Who will use or occupy the facility?

There will be one or more private, contracted, concessionaire opportunities for the project, including, for example: café, outfitter, sport shop, river recreation, marina boating services and related businesses. Actual operators have not been determined.

Public Purpose

River Learning Center will be the gateway to the Mississippi River, welcoming residents and visitors to this national feature with four-season programming that honors, promotes stewardship of, and teaches the culture, history and ecology of the river

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not applicable

Project Contact Person

ThaoMee Xiong
Director of Intergovernmental Relations
651-399-0686
ThaoMee.Xiong@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$3 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | N/A |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Como Park Zoo

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,500 |
| Priority Ranking: | 4 |
| Project Summary: | \$2.5 million in state funds is requested for design development and construction documents for Como Zoo's Orangutan habitat and energy efficiency asset preservation. |

Project Description

Como Park Zoo and Conservatory's Campus Framework addresses critical habitat updates and energy efficiency asset preservation to meet modern zoological practices.

The next area of these improvements focuses on the Zoo entry exhibits which include the orangutan area. The project will include expanded indoor and outdoor areas. A new mesh-enclosed habitat will be added while maintaining the popular moated exhibit. An indoor exhibit space will be built as an addition to the existing building. These spaces will create much more opportunity for enhanced primate choice, activity, play, and movement, plus more flexibility for animal staff to manage the collection. This total project will be fully funded through a State Bonding appropriation and total cost is estimated at \$15,000,000. This bonding request is for \$2,500,000 which would cover design work and construction documents for the orangutan habitat as well as some energy efficiency upgrades (explained below).

Como Park Zoo and Conservatory recently did an energy efficiency audit and set an ambitious goal to reduce energy costs by 20% by 2022. In order to accomplish this goal, some of the campus' systems that are over 100 years old need to be upgraded. The study provided a comprehensive and systematic method of identifying performance and problems with inefficient operations of HVAC, lighting, and other building systems. The study identified a list of minor projects that can be explored with some investment to reduce the consumption and make Como a more energy efficient venue.

Project Rationale

Como Park Zoo and Conservatory is free, interactive, welcoming, and accessible for families from the state of Minnesota and beyond. Como Park Zoo and Conservatory celebrates diversity in many forms, across cultures, ethnicities, socioeconomic circumstances, and generations.

Orangutans have been a part of Como's history since the 1950s and the existing building was built in 1985. Como is a leader in international orangutan work and puts a spotlight on conservation efforts. The project will include expanded indoor and outdoor areas. A new mesh-enclosed habitat will be added while maintaining the popular moated exhibit. A new indoor exhibit space will be constructed as an addition to the existing building, with the hopes to adding a second troupe of orangutans. These spaces will create much more opportunity for enhanced primate choice, activity, play, and movement, plus more flexibility for animal staff to manage the collection.

Como Park Zoo and Conservatory is a center of education and conservation. It also provides a rich

environment for Minnesotans to experience the park and operates 365 days a year, with systems running 24 hours a day for the health of the plants, animals, and guests. Recently a study was completed on how Como could reduce its energy usage by 20%. Fourteen buildings on the Campus were reviewed and nearly 21% of the total electric energy consumption and 25% of the gas consumption is identified as opportunity. The majority of the opportunities were from outdated operating systems in the over 100 year old facility. The funds for asset preservation energy sustainability will allow Como to update these systems and reduces its energy consumption.

Project Timeline

If funded in May 2020, the anticipated timeline will be as follows: June -August 2020: Execute grant agreement with State of Minnesota; August- October 2020 – RFP and contract architecture firms; November 2020-February 2021 – Schematic design and bid energy efficiency projects; March – July 2021 – Design development and energy efficiency projects executed; August 2021- January 2022 – Construction documents and projects completed

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Who will operate the facility?

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Purpose

Zoos offer an opportunity to educate the public about endangered animals and to conserve the species. The focus of environmental efforts takes the form of research, captive breeding of rare animals, and conservation. Studies have shown that AZA-accredited zoos and aquariums enhance the public's understanding of wildlife and of the need to support animal conservation worldwide. Como Park Zoo and Conservatory welcomes 2 million visitors annually and has a unique opportunity to share this experience free of charge and make connection between visitors and wildlife. As a key leader in conservation education, Como can be a leader in the state by reducing its own energy consumption with needed asset preservation improvements. In turn, reduce it's any usage and costs, fueling all our futures.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

ThaoMee Xiong
Director of Intergovernmental Affairs
651-399-0686
ThaoMee.Xiong@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Como Park Zoo

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$13,500 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$13,500 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,700 | \$900 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$800 | \$12,150 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$300 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$13,500 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

International Institute

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$5,500**Priority Ranking:** No Rank

Project Summary: The org. seeks \$5.5 million in state bonding for the renovation, build-out and infrastructure improvement of the organization's planned new facility, including construction of a 16,000 sq. ft. addition. The new facility will be located at 1694 Como Avenue in St. Paul, MN 55108, and will provide necessary space to increase, strengthen and innovate basic needs, education and employment programming that supports Minnesota's future workforce and economic prosperity.

Project Description

This renovation and expansion will centralize workforce training programs and services to better meet community demand and position the Institute to up-skill the New American workforce, having both local and national impact. Through the Next Century Campaign, the Institute will renovate and expand capacity to serve New Americans by:

- Establishing an approximately 16,000 sq. ft. expansion designed specifically to add programming space that is flexible and more efficient in producing expedient outcomes for clients;
- Expanding workforce development programs to include an new career pathway (information technology or another sector) and continued expansion of the Medical Careers Pathway--a pathway that has placed 2800 New Americans in Healthcare jobs in the state--resulting in increased numbers served in high-quality career pathways;
- Creating 6 new classrooms, 6 faculty offices and 5 shared offices to accommodate employment training and facilitate clients' transition to financial independence;
- Building 4 private rooms for confidential counseling and case management;
- Building 2 handicapped accessible bathrooms;
- Constructing a healthcare and hospitality training lab to improve learning and accommodate additional students;
- Improving overall site configuration to foster team collaboration and operational efficiencies; and,
- Renovating and optimizing its existing building to adapt to client needs and rising programmatic demands.

To date, the Institute has successfully purchased land from the MN State Fair adjacent to its existing building, on which the addition will be constructed. Design and construction drawings for the addition and renovation are nearly complete.

Project Rationale

Minnesota's demographics and workforce are changing rapidly. As baby boomers age out of the workforce, New Americans represent a growing portion of the state's overall population; without them, Minnesota's overall growth in the labor force would be shrinking significantly. New Americans are

essential to the state's labor market and economic viability in the global marketplace. Despite this, immigrants coming to Minnesota need support in accessing economic opportunity, education and health care.

Educationally, the majority of immigrant populations tend to be split between limited education or highly advanced academic achievement, with not many in between. Also, cultural knowledge and English language skills can be barriers to navigation of both the affordable housing and healthcare systems. Foreign-born workers typically earn much less than U.S.-born members of the workforce. For example, 2015 median earnings for non-native male workers was approximately \$41,300 per year compared to \$56,200 for native male workers, while females experienced a \$35,700 to \$42,500 gap between non-native and native workers. Furthermore, while the common misperception of refugees is that they receive special government benefits, most receive only a single \$925 grant for living expenses—including housing—upon arrival, and they must also repay all travel expenses to the U.S. government, usually exceeding that amount.

At the same time, while New Americans strive to overcome barriers to becoming contributing members of society, the state's native birth rate is decreasing. Minnesota had approximately 113,000 foreign-born residents in 1990. Currently, 450,000+ (1 in 12) state residents are from foreign countries, more than quadrupling this portion of the population. Projections show that without migration, Minnesota's total population will begin declining in 2040. This means the future of the state's skilled workforce and economic growth will continue relying on the influx of New Americans, and opportunities for them to access programs and services that promote their ability to obtain gainful employment and identify lucrative career pathways. Indeed, New Americans are 24% likelier to be working than U.S.-born counterparts, and New Americans pay approximately \$1.1 billion in state and local taxes in Minnesota. Racial and immigrant disparities in education, employment and health cost Minnesota \$16 billion in 2015 alone. It is imperative that New Americans be welcomed and provided the skills, training and supports they need to succeed so they can achieve their ambitions while contributing to Minnesota's diverse cultural fabric as employed, tax-paying members of society.

Project Timeline

Predesign Sept 2016 – March 2017

Predesign work was establish the program for the Institute's facilities and how best to use the Existing Building and allocate new program space into the Addition. The current building was originally build in 1957 as a Warehouse with Apartment units; the Institute purchased and remodeled the building in 1972, and in 1979 constructed a larger Assembly space. The original warehouse and apartment construction places constraints on how best to Pprogram the Existing Building, and what program areas should be located within the Addition.

Schematic Design April 2017 – May 2018

Schematic Design work located the program uses into the Existing building and Addition based on best area fit and based on public use. Generally, the Existing Building will be used for Office and Administrative program functions. The Existing Assembly Space will be remodeled with better lighting, modern kitchen, and presentation systems. The Addition will house the majority of the Public functions of the building including: Reception, Lobby, Restrooms, Classrooms, and Seminar and Conference spaces.

Design Development June 2018- Nov 2011

Design Development work continued the refinement of the Program, Building Envelope, Building Structural systems, Civil and Stormwater Design, Mechanical systems, Electrical systems, and Plumbing systems.

Design Development Budget/ scope review Nov 2018- May 2019

Feedback from two General Contractors' budget estimates has been used to refine the building design to meet the project budget goals. This information has been used to inform all building systems design.

Construction Documents June 2019- November 2019

Construction Documents are being produced based on the budget information received in the Design Development estimates.

Construction: September 2020- October 2021

Construction is estimated to take 13 months.

Other Considerations

none

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

n/a

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

International Institute

Who will use or occupy the facility?

International Institute

Public Purpose

serving immigrant and refugees

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jane Graupman
Executive Director
651-647-0191
jgraupman@iimn.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$5.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

International Institute

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$4,200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$2,617 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$12,517 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$260 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$151 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$743 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$417 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$10,814 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$132 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$12,517 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | No |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Minnesota Humanities Center

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$750**Priority Ranking:** No Rank

Project Summary: The Minnesota Humanities Center (MHC) requests \$750,000 in state funds to complete urgent repairs and updates to the City of St. Paul's historic building where our programs, offices, and Event Center are housed near Lake Phalen. We received \$1 million of our \$1.75 million request from the 2018 bonding bill for remediation to stop ongoing damage from water intrusion, and this second allocation will help us complete the project and replace an outdated, inefficient HVAC system.

Project Description

Problems persist throughout the building which has total square footage of 21,500. Careful professional analysis estimated construction costs to be \$3.53 million.

The building requires remediation in the following areas to ensure a safe environment for MHC's staff and visitors: Phase 1: Exterior Building Repairs: \$723,000 – To help stop water intrusion and preserve the historic character of the building, the following updates are needed: repairs to roof tiles, stucco, and cast stone wall caps; replacement and repair of the parapet; repair and painting of exterior soffits; waterproofing the foundation wall; and rebuilding area well walls.

Phase 2: HVAC System Replacement: \$2,122,000 – A modern system is necessary to reduce moisture, eliminate mold, conserve energy, automate temperature controls and provide a comfortable environment.

Stage 3: Groundwater Mitigation: \$685,000 – Redoing the basement slab membrane, and adding interior perimeter drain tile are essential to stop water intrusion in the garden level. Garden level renovation to mediate water intrusion and mold in office area of 2,442 square feet.

Nearly \$2.2 million has been secured through private and public funds, including \$1 million in state bonding, \$250,000 in STAR funding from the City of St. Paul, and \$590,000 from local foundations. Another \$600,000 in promising requests to institutional funders is currently pending. Additional bonding is needed to complete the project.

Project Rationale

In 2014, following flooding in the building's garden level, where staff offices, meeting spaces, and overnight guestrooms are located, a facility feasibility study and assessment was completed by Rafferty Rafferty Tollefson Lindeke Architects (now Architecture Advantage). This study called for remediation to the building's envelope to prevent water intrusion and repair damage to the building's exterior as well as replacement of the current HVAC system which lacks automated temperature and air handler controls and has exceeded its expected lifespan.

Project Timeline

At MHC's April 2019 Board Meeting, the Board unanimously voted to approve amending the budget to allow staff to enter into contractual agreements with an Owner's Representative to manage construction and to have architectural drawings completed for the full project. We are now in the process of finalizing contractual agreements with Architecture Advantage to complete the architectural drawings for the project and with TEGRA Group to act as our Owner's Representative. We anticipate that full schematics for the project will be completed by October 2019. Then the project will go out to bid. We estimate acquisition of bids for the project will be received by winter 2019. Construction for Phase one will begin in summer/fall 2020. Phases two and three are slated to be completed by spring/summer 2021. However, this timeline is contingent upon funding and will become more relevant as we move forward with the process.

Other Considerations

This building was designated as an historic property by the City of St. Paul in 1980 and thus must be restored and maintained. It was built in 1924 as the schoolhouse for the original Gillette Children's Hospital. Designed by renowned local architect Clarence H. Johnston, the building features many significant and unique decorative details, including delightful carved tiles and evocative plaster sculptures.

The building is the heart of MHC's operations and an important underpinning to the financial health of the organization. MHC is a nonprofit that serves as a critical hub for public humanities scholarship, engagement, and resources throughout the state. MHC produces impactful programs and grantmaking in diverse and geographically dispersed communities, touching 36,100 people in 34 municipalities statewide in 2017-18 alone. This building is the foundation to MHC's success, both programmatically and fiscally – it's home to our administrative offices, hosts programs and events, and generates revenue to support the organization. Additionally, more than 10,000 visitors attend meetings and retreats at our full-service Event Center annually. It primarily serves nonprofits and government agencies, providing an affordable gathering space for these organizations to build and strengthen their missions and work. The Event Center, which includes five meeting spaces and 15 overnight guest rooms, is a business-generating facility for St. Paul's East Side – bringing in state and national clients who patronize restaurants and businesses in the area.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Paul

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Humanities Center

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Minnesota Humanities Center

Public Purpose

The building supports a nonprofit that serves communities statewide as well as a full-service Event Center that provides an affordable gathering space for other not for profit organizations and brings

business St. Paul's East Side.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Carol Aegerter
Executive Director
651-772-4243
carol@mnhum.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$750,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Minnesota Humanities Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$1,000 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$250 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$925 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$605 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$2,175 | \$1,355 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$205 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$1,775 | \$1,355 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$25 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$70 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$2,175 | \$1,355 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Playwrights' Center

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$1,100**Priority Ranking:** No Rank**Project Summary:** 2019 PHASE I Request Amount: \$1,100,000. This would go toward funding acquisition, predesign, and design. Although not expected, any remainder would apply to complete the full project. Because the site acquisition must take place soon, this comprises the critical 2019 steps for this project to move forward in St. Paul.**Project Description**

\$4 million in state funds (of \$8 million project) is requested to build a center to serve as an international hub for playwrights, teachers, students and audiences that will provide a community gathering space, multi-purpose education classrooms and multi-use theater space. The Playwrights' Center is the only U.S. nonprofit focused solely on sustaining the livelihood of playwrights. The facility will be built at 710 Raymond Avenue next to the Green Line LRT and close to the A-Line Rapid Bus transit, to provide access to the Twin Cities community and visitors from around the world.

After discussion with City staff, and in the spirit of working to move as many projects forward as possible, we have agreed to break this project in to two phases.

2019 PHASE I Request Amount: \$1,100,000. This would go toward funding acquisition, predesign, and design. Although not expected, any remainder would apply to complete the full project. Because the site acquisition must take place soon, this comprises the critical 2019 steps for this project to move forward in St. Paul.

2020 PHASE II Request Amount: \$2,900,000. We will pursue the remainder of the project with City support in 2020.

Project Rationale**Why is this project needed?**

A 75% Increase in demand for programs and services from Playwrights' Center membership. The Playwrights' Center provides programming to 240+ students, 2,000 audience members, and membership for over 2,000 playwrights. The demand for programs and services from our membership has grown 75% in the past 5 years. The Core Writer and Fellowship Programs provide 45 playwrights the time and tools to develop new work over a 1-3-year period, and connects them with an extensive network of theaters. Additionally, over 60% of the plays featured in Playwrights' Center seasons – the PlayLabs Festival and the Ruth Easton New Play Series - go on to full productions and professional theaters. The national average suggests it takes seven years to bring a new play to production, but through its renowned development and connections programs, the Playwrights' Center cuts that time to Design a space that is a model for community-based approaches.

This one-of-a-kind arts center will serve as a local, national and international hub, filled with playwrights, actors, directors, students and audiences of all kinds – where every writer has the opportunity to improve their craft, push boundaries and develop their voice. The Center seeks to

provide an even more inclusive gathering space where playwrights, artists and community members can meet, share ideas and strengthen the arts and cultural community in the Twin Cities. The space will be an innovative, accessible, multi-functional facility dedicated to theatrical storytelling, where playwrights have the room to work with the resources they need to engage, collaborate and produce and where artistic leaders will see that work and commit to producing it back at their theaters around the world. New technology to share Playwrights' Center workshops, classes and training throughout Minnesota and beyond.

The latest technologies are employed to allow students from Duluth to Dubai to collaborate on projects together- from comprehensive play development programs to workshops, seminars and accredited college classes.

Project Timeline

Project Schedule

- Design Complete – Q3 2020
- Building Permit – Q2 2021
- Construction Start – Q3 2021
- FF&E Installation – Q3 2021
- Construction Completion – Q4 2021
- Certificate of Occupancy – Q4 2021

Other Considerations

N/A

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Paul

Who will operate the facility?

Playwrights' Center

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Playwrights' Center

Public Purpose

Our project will directly benefit the general public by expanding the availability of community space and expanding our public events such as public readings, classes, and writing seminars, which are attended by 1,500 community members a year. The atrium will serve as a community gathering place in addition to public performance space, while a library and great hall in the building will offer flexible space for the community. The project will also enable PWC to scale our programs to provide more artists with the space and the resources they need to create.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Robert Chelimsky

Executive Director
612-547-5731
robertc@pwcenter.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Playwrights' Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$2,900 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$3,250 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,100 | \$2,900 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Victoria Theater Arts

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$2,400 |
| Priority Ranking: | No Rank |
| Project Summary: | \$2.4 million in state funds is requested for acquisition, predesign, design, construction, furnishing, and equipping a vacant theater for use as a community arts center for the Frogtown & Rondo neighborhoods in Saint Paul. |

Project Description

The Victoria Theater Arts Center (VTAC) will be a multi-faceted, 5500 sq. ft. community arts center serving as a creative focal point and community heart for the diverse communities of Frogtown & Rondo. The surrounding communities are rich with creative talents and people but there are very limited facilities in the immediate area for people to share, engage, perform, learn, and experience these cultural riches. VTAC will be that place, vibrant day and night with performances - all types of music, theater, dance, spoken word, film, and more - as well as classes, workshops, events, meetings, and other community gatherings, for youth, adults, and elders.

Built in 1915, the historic Victoria Theater has served many purposes, but has sat vacant for the past 20 years. As such, it requires a complete and total renovation of every aspect of the building to transform it into a place that all members of the neighborhood can call home.

The new facility will include a large live performance venue, able to host any number of performance groups. This space will feature flexible seating for 120-200 people, feature state of the art lighting and sound systems, a fully functional and secure technical booth, and backstage amenities. There will also be a flexible convening space, capable of holding community meetings, classes, smaller scale performances, or other smaller events. One of the most exciting features will be flexible outdoor performance space, which will utilize the pocket park on the west side of the of the building. Upon entering the building, there will be welcoming lobby and box office, and a bank of fully accessible bathrooms. In addition, there will be office space for VTAC staff, as well as storage. We have been working closely with award-winning architects VJAA for all stages of the design process.

The total cost of construction and construction-related expenses will be \$4.799 million. Key funding sources include the City of Saint Paul, Saint Paul & Minnesota Foundations, McKnight Foundation, Mardag & Bigelow Foundations, Bush Foundation, Knight Foundation, and a number of private foundations and contributions from individuals.

Project Rationale

This project is critical to the community in which it is located. It will create a vibrant arts center for diverse communities that surround it which currently have no such place for artistic and cultural expression, creativity, exploration, and learning.

The public sector helps meet other community needs such as schools, parks, roads, and trash

collection; the Victoria Theater Arts Center is an important opportunity to demonstrate that people coming together to share their stories, visions, creativity, and modes of personal and social expression for community celebration, empowerment and healing: are just as necessary to build resilient healthy communities. Especially in an area with such a diversity of voices, art has the power to lift up community, engage in hard and healing conversations, and celebrate and share life experiences.

Frogtown and Rondo, surrounding the Victoria, have seen significant public investments, such as Green Line LRT, Frogtown Park & Farm, and the new Frogtown Recreation Center, which benefit the community and its marginalized groups. Creating a place for art, community, and creative expression is also necessary again, to help create a strong and healthy community. The outpouring of interest, support, and creative talent, by adults and particularly by youth, during our community engagement projects surrounding the Victoria is profound and clearly demonstrates the need for creative space in the neighborhood.

The cultural and ethnic diversity of the communities surrounding the Victoria creates the compelling need and opportunity for the Victoria Theater Arts Center. It will encourage, support, and present diverse forms of artistic expression from the diverse groups in surrounding communities both near and far.

VTAC will act as an economic driver and heart for the neighborhood. Arts centers are well-known for their ability to bring in over \$20 to neighborhood businesses for each dollar spent at the venue. VTAC will make the neighborhood safer, more welcoming, and most of all a home for the imagination and dreams of the community.

Project Timeline

Oct. 2019-Jan. 2020 Schematic design finished, building stabilization work, Pre-design and Design Development (DD) with VJAA Architects, Capital Campaign continues
Jan 2020- City of St. Paul/HPC review, Capital Campaign continues
Jan. 2020-May 2020- Construction Documents, Cost Estimates, Capital Campaign
May 2020- Building acquisition, submit documents for permitting/bidding, Capital Campaign complete (with large foundations secured contingent on bonding)
June-August 2020- Bidding & Permitting, Construction Administration, Notice to proceed, Programming scheduling begins.
Sept 2020-July 2021- Building Construction, continued programming scheduling and fundraising
August 2021- Grand Opening

Other Considerations

This project has been in process since 2012, with a number of successes, including:

- a year-long community design process, led by artist organizers and professional architects, which gathered invaluable information about programming and building aesthetic.
- a complete business plan has been drawn up, largely based on input from arts venues of similar size, and has received positive feedback from funders
- a feasibility study has been created, with full analysis of the organization within the economic landscape of the neighborhood
- a professional fundraising team has already worked for over a year, garnering support from the local philanthropic community.
- Over \$200,000 in funding has already been received for all of the above projects, indicative of

strong foundation support for the project and its success.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

Victoria Theater Arts Center

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Victoria Theater Arts Center (which will include organizational programming, and short term rental to community and arts groups.)

Public Purpose

VTAC will provide a home for live performance, artistic expression and education, youth development, and community connections in the Frogtown/Rondo neighborhoods of Saint Paul.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Tyler Olsen-Highness
Executive Director
651-795-8239
tyler@victoriatheater.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2.4 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Victoria Theater Arts

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$612 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$1,787 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,799 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$542 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$19 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$330 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,703 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$55 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,799 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

YMCA

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$1,600 |
| Priority Ranking: | No Rank |
| Project Summary: | \$1,600,000 in state funds is requested to predesign and design a new facility in downtown St. Paul for a YMCA community hub. The new facility shall provide services for youth, adults, and families, including programming in Youth Development - Homelessness prevention and juvenile justice work, Social Responsibility - Equity, Inclusion and Diversity offerings and Healthy Living - holistic health, lifelong fitness in a community-focused facility. |

Project Description

The YMCA of the Greater Twin Cities is requesting planning dollars for a proposed 27,000 sq. ft. community hub on the plaza of the Osborn370 building. The facility will include Youth Development and intervention programmatic space –

1. Confidential entry point for youth seeking assistance
2. Confidential meeting space: 2 to 3 small conference rooms that hold 2 to 4 people.
3. Convening Space: holds 25 people with technology support (life skills, career/job pathways).
4. 4. Large Space with lockers for youth who are in transition to have a place to store their belongings.
5. 5. Showers and laundry access for the youth (do a load of laundry while meeting with their life coach).

Social Responsibility programming, through the YMCA's Equity, Innovation and Diversity center, will be provide throughout the community with the downtown branch as its Ramsey County hub.

Healthy Living space will include a healthy living center, studio class rooms, and locker rooms. The building will be designed to allow for the future addition of a gymnasium. Many of these components will also be shared with Youth Development to maximize the impact to both areas of impact. There will also be associated support space in the facility. The facility will be constructed to include 1 story above the plaza and will renovate the existing floor below the plaza.

The Osborn370 location provides the Y the unique opportunity to champion all that a Y can be to a community because it offers separate and distinct "front doors" to the facility. Youth Intervention and Social Responsibility elements can be offered at the street level, near the light rail station and Healthy Living components will be offered on the plaza level. Internally in the facility, programs and services can cross use all that the Y has to offer for effective and efficient delivery of services needed by the Community.

The principal gift commitments require a matching state bonding grant. To date the YMCA has raised over \$4 million dollars and have been invited to apply for an additional \$3.75 million dollars from area foundations and individuals committed to our vision around truly serving downtown St. Paul in Youth

Development, Social Responsibility and Healthy Living.

Project Rationale

At the YMCA, we know that solving the complex challenges people face takes bold work. That's why we relentlessly pursue new ways to build thriving communities that will last for generations. We push what's possible, challenge limits and open doors so everyone has an equal chance to succeed. For more than 160 years, the Y has worked side by side with its neighbors, listening and responding to community needs with relevant, transformative programs and activities. The current downtown location in Galtier Towers is over 25 years old, and no longer stands as an example of what the YMCA can provide for the community.

We're Challenging Limits: A new location will allow us to become an integral fixture in a developing neighborhood, establishing a modern venue that supports our mission to provide programming to all people, no matter their circumstances.

We're Opening Doors: The new location will allow the YMCA to provide the community a neighborhood hub, ideally situated to serve a large, diverse audience, ensuring all people have a place to invest in their fitness and the Community's wellbeing.

We're Pushing What's Possible: The new location will sit at the nexus of many major transit routes, making it accessible to everyone from nearby corporate employers to St. Paul youth and multi-cultural populations.

The downtown YMCA will be a place where youth and their families can thrive. By staying sensitive to the needs of our community, we've evolved programs to keep up with changing times, while staying true to our mission.

Our innovative development programs help young people fulfill their potential and discover what they're capable of. We break down barriers for youth at the Y, in their homes and in the streets. Within the new downtown YMCA, we will have space devoted to the Y's Youth Intervention Services. Youth Intervention Services offers a suite of services to support the young people in our community, aged 10-24, who most need support. This includes youth who are experiencing or at risk of homelessness; have involvement in the juvenile justice or foster care systems; or who are disconnected from family, school, or community. We provide young people with the resources, support, and connections they need to address the barriers they face—partnering with young people to chart a course to a successful future.

The new location would significantly expand our reach and ability to serve St. Paul's youth, building long-term relationships with people of all backgrounds. And Best Buy's Teen Tech Center is right around the corner.

From youth enrichment to health and wellbeing, a new YMCA at the epicenter of downtown St. Paul will provide an opportunity to better serve St. Paul's residents and workers. Together we can build a stronger St. Paul.

Project Timeline

January 2020-May 2020: Legislative Lobbying Efforts

June 2020- December 2020: Predesign and Design Efforts

January 2021-May 2022: Legislative Lobbying efforts

June 2022- August 2022: Preconstruction

September 2022- October 2023: Construction

Other Considerations

The new St. Paul YMCA project has been under active consideration since 2017.

In 2018, Senator Pappas and Representative Mariani introduced SF 2436/HF2707

In 2019, Senator Pappas introduced SF 607, along with the entire St. Paul Senate delegation. Co-authors are Senators Cohen, Hawj, Marty and Capital Investment Chair Senjem.

Representative Mariani introduced HF 872, along with the entire St. Paul House delegation. Co-authors are Representatives Moran, Pinto, Hausman, Her, Lillie, Mahoney, Lesch, Xiong, J, and Fischer, and House Capital Investment Ranking Member Urdahl.

SF 607/HF 872 remain under active consideration by the Capital Investment Committees for inclusion in the 2020 bonding bill.

In addition to the already committed and funded contributions now in hand, the Ecolab Foundation, the Securian Foundation and the St. Paul Foundation are awaiting state bonding funding to provide matching funds.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Paul or the City's designated government entity (i.e. The Saint Paul Port Authority)

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Paul or the City's designated government entity (i.e. The Saint Paul Port Authority)

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Community members, including youth, and downtown work force employees, and YMCA members and guests.

Public Purpose

An essential part of the YMCA mission is to partner with all levels of government to provide multiple programs that supplement and enhance community and social services. Federal, State and Local funding for these programs flows through YMCA locations that provide the bricks and mortar facilities to deliver these public purpose programs, services and community benefits. A significant portion of the staff and facilities that are part of the new Downtown YMCA operations are designed for and devoted to providing and enhancing these federal, state and locally contracted programs. An example of YMCA and government funded programs can be seen in our Youth Intervention Services. The recipients of these government funded programs, as well as traditional public members of the YMCA, benefit from the YMCA mission of promoting Youth Development, Healthy Living and Social Responsibility. This is the public purpose of the YMCA and of its request for State Capital Investment funds.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Amanda Novak
Project Coordinator

612-465-0557

amanda.novak@ymcamn.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$1.6 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

YMCA

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$8,400 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,590 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$18,490 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$700 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$120 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,480 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$149 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$16,013 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,628 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$18,490 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | Yes |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Batcher Block Opera House Restoration | 1 | GO | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 |

Batcher Block Opera House Restoration

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$8,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$8.5 million in state funds is requested for the acquisition, predesign, design, construction, and furnishing of the Batcher Block Opera House in Staples to be converted into a multi-use performing arts facility. The now-dormant building once acted as the cultural hub of Staples and the greater region since it first opened in 1907; this funding and rehabilitation will again create an arts and education hub hosting performances, classes, and community events.

Project Description

Listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 2004, the Batcher Block Opera House is described in the National Register documents as “one of the best-preserved rural opera houses in Minnesota.” The project scope consists of the city acquisition of the building from the current private owner, restoration of the existing performance space, which contains original frescos and wall murals from 1907 as well as the original stage and balcony built in an isoacoustic curve to maximize acoustics; as well as renovations to the first floor to house classrooms, a lobby / gathering space, a commercial kitchen and concessions area, new bathrooms, and additional amenity improvements. In addition, the project includes the installation of an elevator, new mechanical and electrical systems, shell upgrades, and asbestos abatement.

The main floor is 9,000 square feet, and the second and third floors, which will be converted to space for an artist in residence program, are long and narrower at about 4,000 square feet not including the footprint of the opera house. The opera house is 5,000 square feet with two private boxes and a balcony occupying a footprint on the second and third floors. The rooftop will be equipped with an indoor-outdoor flexible event space and patio, with 800 square feet enclosed and 1,800 square feet of outdoor space.

Plans call for an addition of 1,800 square feet of event support space on the first floor including a freight elevator to the second floor stage and small vestibule, as well as 1,200 square feet of new space on the second floor as event support space adjacent to the stage.

The total cost for renovations including professional fees and contingencies are estimated at \$15.088 million.

Total square feet of existing facilities to be renovated: 22,000

Total square feet to be added: 5,600

Project Rationale

Occupying most of a city block of downtown Staples, the Batcher Block Opera House has served as the cultural heart of the city of Staples. Currently, the City of Staples, along with multiple community stakeholders and partner groups, have a chance to restore the now-dormant space to preserve the

historic character of the building while making necessary changes and upgrades for the building to function with a new use.

The Region 5 area has seen significant growth in cultural amenities in recent years, such as the Little Falls SPROUT Food Hub and the recent work on the future Region 5 Children's Museum in the Brainerd Lakes Area. The Batcher Block Opera House will act as the missing piece in the cultural landscape of Region 5: a performance arts hub offering space to performing artists throughout the region, state, and beyond. The Opera House will function as a **cultural destination**, continuing to elevate Region 5 as an arts and culture community and increasing the success of Staples and partner communities in utilizing arts and culture as an economic driver.

The Batcher Block Opera House can serve as a regional economic driver by incorporating both original programming aimed at audiences within a 90-120 minute radius as well as community-driven programming which may draw a more localized audience. The programming calendar will be **highly collaborative** in nature, ensuring a consistently full events calendar with many partners to aid in program success. Program partners will include Five Wings Arts Council, Staples-Motley Schools, local performing ensembles including Staples' rich legacy of community choral groups, local artists, and performance ensembles from across the region and state.

With a mission to "teach, train, and entertain," the Opera House will contain programming for all ages and audience groups, from experiencing performances to taking classes to training the next generation of cultural professionals. As a cultural hub, the Opera House will act as the catalytic force in the greater downtown redevelopment of Staples, attracting residents and visitors alike to the downtown core. In addition, the Opera House will help attract and retain a strong employee and resident base to the greater region and enhance the livability of the greater area.

In addition, this project will support the preservation and rehabilitation of one of the most prominent buildings in Staples and one of the most unique opera houses in not only the state of Minnesota but across the country.

The building will support a variety of uses, which include:

- A restored, highly unique performance space with diverse programming and rentals
- Flexible classroom/event space available for community and private events, including a demonstration culinary kitchen
- Concessions area to service events and rental in the building
- Lodging space to host touring artists and educators as well as, long-term, an artist in residency program
- Office and meeting space for Batcher Block staff as well as potentially for other area organizations
- Outdoor performance and gathering space
- Batcher Block Opera House "Museum" or other historic elements, drawing in tour groups
- Pop-up events such as Farmers Markets, Makers Markets, and more in the first floor and in the outdoor space

Project Timeline

Funding awarded: May 2020

Design & Engineering: July 2020-May 2021

Construction Begins: May 2021

Construction Ends: November 2022

Occupancy: December 2022

Other Considerations

NA

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None – the 501(c) 3 will manage and operate the building and operate as a self-sustaining entity, entering into a long-term triple-net lease with the City.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Staples

Who will operate the facility?

The Batcher Block Opera House, a nonprofit 501(c)3 which will be established in 2019, will operate the facility and all programs. The nonprofit will enter into a lease agreement with the city which will be submitted to MMB for approval.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The Batcher Block Opera House will occupy the facility for events, staffing, and operational purposes daily. Private use of the space will occur for event rentals, which will operate for an agreed-upon amount of time with supervision from Batcher Block Opera House staff.

Public Purpose

Economic and Community Development, Heritage Preservation, Arts and Culture, Teaching and Training

Description of Previous Appropriations

NA - No state appropriations have been allocated to this project.

Project Contact Person

Melissa Radermacher
Economic Development Director
218-894-2550
mradermacher@ci.staples.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$8.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Batcher Block Opera House Restoration

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$8,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$8,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$1,350 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$96 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$672 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,896 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$3,150 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$1,836 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$17,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Steele County Fair Electrical Project | 1 | GF | 750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Steele County Fair Electrical Project**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$750**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$750,000 in state funds is requested to relocate all electrical power and overhead lines underground.**Project Description**

The project involves relocating all electrical power and overhead lines underground.

Project Rationale

To meet the requirements of NFPA 70 (National Electrical Code) that is covered under MN Statutes 326B.35

Project Timeline

April-June, 2020 - Design and Engineering

September - December, 2020 - Construction

Other Considerations

The project will ensure compliance with electrical standards and a safe environment for users of the property during the fair and other events.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Steele County is requesting \$750,000 in state funds for this project.

Who will own the facility?

Steele County

Who will operate the facility?

Steele County Agricultural Society

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Steele County, Steele County Agricultural Society, City of Owatonna, Other public and private organizations, Members of the public from the region

Public Purpose

Steele County Free Fair and other community and regional events

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$0

Project Contact Person

Scott Golberg
Administrator
507-444-7431
sgolberg@co.steele.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Steele County Fair Electrical Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Historic Bergstein Buildings Rehabilitation Project | 1 | GO | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Historic Bergstein Buildings Rehabilitation Project

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$800

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The City of Stillwater will rehabilitate the historic Moritz Bergstein Shoddy Mill and Warehouse buildings for reuse by the City of Stillwater, other government and non-profit entities, and, potentially, a private concessionaire for visitors and St. Croix Loop Trail users.

Project Description

The City of Stillwater will undertake a partial rehabilitation of the Moritz Bergstein Shoddy Mill and Warehouse, rehabilitating the exterior of the Mill building, the lower level of the Warehouse, and conducting site improvements for visitors and trail users. An intact example of a property providing insight into the daily living patterns of Germanic-Jewish immigrants to Minnesota, and their efforts to sustain themselves in a new land, these structures were listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2008. The mill and warehouse building were moved to their current location on the St. Croix River in 2012 in keeping with a Section 106 mitigation agreement completed as part of planning for the new St. Croix River Bridge. The buildings are now owned by the City of Stillwater and the first structures in the City that Loop Trail users from Wisconsin will encounter.

Project Rationale

The Shoddy Mill and Warehouse are extremely simple buildings. The Warehouse is a simple wood-frame building combining traditional timber framed structural elements with conventional balloon framing. The Mill building is crudely constructed of local stone, with a roof supported on salvaged iron rafters, reflecting the history of the site as an early recycling center. Though the structures were relocated into the City as part of the St. Croix River Crossing project, the city must cost of the initial rehabilitation and ongoing major maintenance and repair. The properties are unlikely to generate sufficient revenue to fully offset the full costs of rehabilitation and operations.

A number of public entities have demonstrated their interest in preservation of the properties and have already invested substantial financial resources to document and move the buildings. In 2014 the City of Stillwater conducted a reuse study, interviewing dozens of residents, community stakeholders, and outside public agencies. There is nearly unanimous agreement that reuse should take advantage of the riverfront location and proximity to the St. Croix River Loop Trail bike/pedestrian trail system. There is a plethora of agencies and non-profit organizations willing and eager to provide programming at the site.

Project Timeline

- Business Plan completion - December 2019
- Organizational Agreements Finalized- July 1, 2020
- Pre-design/Design Elements completed - March 1, 2021

Rehabilitation/Construction completed - June 1, 2022

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None anticipated.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Stillwater.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Stillwater, agencies and non-profit organizations providing programming at the site.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Partner agencies and non-profit organizations providing programming at the site.

Public Purpose

The site would be operated as a partnership between the city of Stillwater, other government and non-profit entities, and, potentially, a private concessionaire. A coalition of non-profits and public agencies would provide visitor services information, programming and exhibits interpreting the history of the Bergstein operation, the archaeological history of the site, environmental features of the site, and the National Park Service St. Croix Riverway, the foundation of Minnesota's lumbering history; a site that is of state and regional significance.

Description of Previous Appropriations

St. Croix Riverbank Restoration Project

Project Contact Person

Tom McCarty
City Administrator
651-430-8800
tmccarty@ci.stillwater.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Historic Bergstein Buildings Rehabilitation Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$25 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,275 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | No |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Cargo Aircraft Hangar | 1 | GO | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Cargo Aircraft Hangar

AT A GLANCE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$6,750 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | \$6.75 million in state funds is requested to predesign, design, construct, furnish, and equip a new cargo hangar building for the Thief River Falls Regional Airport. |

Project Description

This project includes construction of a 280'x170' clear span hangar with attached office space (40'x60'), parking area, roadway connection, and utility hookups. The building will be approximately 50,000 square feet. Total cost of the building, pavement areas, and utility hookups is estimated at \$7.5 million. The Thief River Falls Regional Airport Authority is seeking a 90/10 state/local cost share for the project. There will also be a separately constructed aircraft apron (approximately 520'x250') which is eligible to receive 90% federal funding.

Project Rationale

The need for this project stems from the incredible growth in cargo activity to and from the Thief River Falls Regional Airport. FedEx, UPS, and DHL all support operations out of the airport using various sized aircraft. FedEx's largest aircraft is the CRJ200, operating four nights per week transporting freight directly to its hub in Memphis. UPS plans to start operating the CRJ200 this summer to its hub in Louisville five nights per week and the aircraft will also haul freight back to Thief River Falls for delivery around the region. With two CRJ200's being operated, UPS's and FedEx's sub-contractor will not be able fit both aircraft in the existing hangar. This will especially be problematic during the winter months and may lead to a reduction in reliability of operations due to time spent in the extreme cold.

Freight operations from the Thief River Falls Regional Airport are caused by the continued success of businesses in Northwest Minnesota. Most notable among them is Digi-Key Electronics, shipping electronic components around the world. In 2018 for example, Digi-Key's revenues grew by \$800 million dollars over 2017, bringing their annual sales to \$3.1 billion. With 20% of all Digi-Key packages being shipped from the Thief River Falls Regional Airport, the size of aircraft and frequency of flights has been steadily increasing.

It should also be noted that due to the presence of UPS, FedEx, and DHL, the citizens of northwestern Minnesota as well as other local businesses beyond Digi-Key are also benefiting. With the growth of business by online retailers such as Amazon.com, there is more and more demand for air freight into and out of our region. In addition, other regional businesses such as Textron/Arctic Cat can now rely on UPS to bring parts in overnight to meet the business's "just-in-time" inventory method. Sanford Health System in Thief River Falls and other area healthcare facilities are also periodically requesting and receiving overnight delivery of medical supplies for their needs. While these are just two examples, numerous other businesses are benefiting in a similar fashion due to the local presence of our airport and carriers such as UPS, FedEx, and DHL.

Project Timeline

This project is being coordinated with a study of the airport's runway length and site placement for commercial hangars. The master plan update will kick off in July/August of 2019 and will place priority on building site selection should funds become available for construction. The estimated construction schedule is as follows:

Legislative Approval – May 2020

Pre-design – July 2020

Final Design – August 2020

Bid Advertising – September 2020

Construction – October 2020

Other Considerations

The previously constructed Multi-Purpose Hangar that was financed in large part through Minnesota state bonding was instrumental to allow for the growth of cargo out of the airport over the past ten years. Construction of that hangar improved a weak link in the freight companies' ability to move packages reliably. The Multi-Purpose Hangar at the Thief River Falls airport is a perfect example of how a public/private partnership can benefit both parties and foster economic growth. In building this second cargo hangar with help from the State of Minnesota, we wish to continue that partnership which will support and foster continued economic growth in Thief River Falls and the surrounding area. We also want to take this opportunity to say thank you to our elected officials for past assistance in bonding projects.

We would also like to note that our existing hangar will continue to be used despite the construction of this second hangar. Airport administration has received multiple requests for heated hangar space from several businesses operating at the airport. Some of these businesses include: Boutique Air, Arctic Cat, DHL, Minnesota DNR, Thief River Aviation (FBO), and numerous transient aircraft.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Thief River Falls Regional Airport Authority

Who will operate the facility?

Thief River Falls Regional Airport Authority

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The building will be lease to a private entity known as IFL Group (sub-contractor for UPS and FedEx) or similarly sized air cargo entity. Due to this reason the Airport Authority understands there will need to be use agreement in place.

Public Purpose

The public purpose for this project is to support economic growth that is occurring in Northwest Minnesota which will in turn support job creation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Joe Hedrick
Airport Manager
218-684-1013
trfairport@mncable.net

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Cargo Aircraft Hangar

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$6,625 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$75 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Three Rivers Park District

Projects Summary

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Mississippi Gateway Regional Park | 1 | GO | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 8,500 | 0 | 0 | 8,500 | 0 | 0 |

Mississippi Gateway Regional Park

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$8,500

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: General obligation bond proceeds in the amount of \$8.5 million are requested to design and construct Mississippi Gateway Regional Park, located in Brooklyn Park, MN. The requested \$8.5 million will be matched by an additional \$21.5 million of local, regional and federal funds to design and construct all aspects of the park, including the Mississippi Gateway Center, the Nature’s Highline walkway, a Mini-Mississippi water play feature, trails, picnic shelters, and other improvements.

Project Description

Mississippi Gateway Regional Park is a partnership between Three Rivers Park District and the City of Brooklyn Park, combining Coon Rapids Dam Regional Park in Brooklyn Park and the Brooklyn Park Environmental Nature Area into one 260-acre regional park on the banks of the Mississippi River. The park will be a year-round connection for all people to celebrate the Mississippi River, learn about nature and enjoy the outdoors.

Three Rivers Park District and the City of Brooklyn Park worked together to complete a master plan that re-envision the park to better meet the needs of the public now and in the future. Development of the master plan was guided by the findings from extensive engagement with targeted populations. These populations included current park users, populations underrepresented in the park and partner agencies. Brooklyn Park is recognized as one of the most diverse cities in Minnesota, and much emphasis was placed on listening to the ideas and feedback from individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and new residents.

Based on the themes and responses from the public engagement, the park’s key features include: a new Mississippi Gateway Center (13,400 SF), Nature’s Highline elevated tree canopy walkway, nature play areas, Mini-Mississippi water play feature and education area, learning labs and nature interpretation nodes, improved trails, fishing, picnicking, non-motorized boat launch, archery, an off-leash dog area, and natural areas.

The intent of the park is to connect people to nature and the Mississippi River in a manner in which they are comfortable. Portions of the park will be more developed and comfortable for people with limited experience in nature and other portions will be minimally developed, allowing for immersion in nature. This spectrum of facility development within the park will accommodate the public no matter their comfort level with nature, and encourages people to explore and discover new areas of the park as they become more comfortable in the outdoors.

Initially, visitors will experience a fairly urban setting, with a visitor center, picnic and play areas, community gathering spaces, and a “Mini-Mississippi” interactive water feature. There will also be outdoor recreation skills classes, nature programming, and a free gear-lending library. Opportunities transition to a more natural setting as visitors move south along the river, highlighted by a tree-top canopy walk, nature play area, paved trail network, and observation points. The southern third of the

park is limited to non-paved trails and an education outpost. Visitors then choose to explore increasing degrees of “wilderness” at their own pace. During the winter months, there will be beginner-level cross country ski trails and equipment available.

The total estimated cost for development of the park is \$30 million. The requested \$8.5 million in general obligation bonds would be matched by:

Three Rivers Park District (\$13.055 million)

Brooklyn Park (\$4.3 million)

National Park Service/Federal Land Access Grants (\$2.145 million)

Federal Transportation Grant (\$1.6 million)

Hennepin County (\$400,000)

The master plan and the engagement process used has received national awards from the:

Project Rationale

The Mississippi River is one of the most significant natural resources in Minnesota; in Hennepin County much of its shoreline is privately held, making this public parkland a valuable asset to the county, region and state. The park will serve as the northern gateway to the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (a unit of the National Park Service) and as a regional hub for recreation and outdoor education. Visitors to Mississippi Gateway Regional Park will be able to access and enjoy the River from its shoreline and from the walkway that stretches across the river above the Coon Rapids Dam.

Brooklyn Park is one of the most diverse communities in Minnesota, and the proposed capital improvements are designed with the goal of better serving everyone in the community. The plans for Mississippi Gateway Regional Park focus on making the transition from the social, vibrant, developed areas of the park to the quiet, more remote and undeveloped portions of the park in a way that makes visitors feel safe, comfortable and welcoming. The park improvements will connect people to nature in a manner in which they are comfortable, ultimately transforming novice park visitors into environmental stewards.

Additionally, Mississippi Gateway Regional Park will be one of the primary nature-based education and recreation centers in the Three Rivers Park District system. Programming focused on nature and recreation education will help connect people to the Mississippi River and the habitat that surrounds it. The park’s master plan is specifically designed to focus on introducing people to nature through a variety of educational and recreational offerings.

Project Timeline

| Proposed Project Timeline – Phase 1 (2017-2020) Pavement Reconstruction & River Access and Trail Improvements Project | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Project Phase | Est. Time | Est. Start (mo/yr) | Est. End (mo/yr) |
| Design | Pavement Reconstruction | 14 months | July 2017 | Sept 2018 |
| | River Access & Trail Improvements | 14 months | Nov 2018 | Dec 2019 |

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Bidding | Pavement Reconstruction | 2 months | Sept 2018 | Oct 2018 |
| | River Access & Trail Improvements | 2 months | Dec 2019 | Jan 2020 |
| Construction | Pavement Reconstruction | 12 months | Dec 2018 | Nov 2019 |
| | River Access & Trail Improvements | 8 months | Apr 2020 | Nov 2020 |
| Proposed Project Timeline - Phase 2 (2020 - 2024) Site & Buildings | | | | |
| | Project Phase | Est. Time | Est. Start (mo/yr) | Est. End (mo/yr) |
| Pre-Design | Scoping Documents, Facility Program Planning, & Stakeholder Engagement | 5 months | Sept 2020 | Feb 2021 |
| | Consultant Design & Construction Management Team Procurement | 3 months | Nov 2020 | Feb 2021 |
| | Schematic Design & Stakeholder Engagement | 4 months | Feb 2021 | Jun 2021 |
| Design-Bidding | Design Development, Cost Estimates, & Stakeholder Engagement | 6 months | June 2021 | Dec 2021 |
| | Construction Documents, Phasing Plans, & Regulatory Permits | 8 - 11 months | Dec 2021 | Aug 2022 / Nov 2022 |
| Construction | Bidding - Site | 2 months | Aug 2022 | Sept 2022 |
| | Bidding - Buildings | 2 months | Dec 2022 | Jan 2023 |
| | Construction – Site *assumes no work during winter months | 16 months* | Oct 2022 | Dec 2024 |
| | Construction - Buildings | 23 months | Feb 2023 | Dec 2024 |

Other Considerations

As its new name suggests, the vision for the park is to serve as a gateway to the Mississippi River, and one important element of welcoming all visitors is free access. As with each of Three Rivers Park District parks, Mississippi Gateway Regional Park will be free for the public to enter and use. This project expands such key free park features as picnic areas, trails and access to the river for fishing and paddling.

Additionally, the park's recreation development, natural and cultural resource management plans, program offerings and over-arching operation plan will focus on actively serving the community. While there are many strategies and tools to do this, implementing the following Action Goals will overcome the identified barriers and successfully realize the Vision Statement's intent:

Be welcoming and engaging to everyone.

Celebrate the Mississippi River as the heart of the park.

Introduce people to nature and outdoor recreation.

Provide activity and purpose year-round.

All significant development, operation and maintenance decisions for this park are intended to support fulfillment of these Action Goals.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Three Rivers Park District is not requesting additional state funding to support operating efforts.

Who will own the facility?

Each entity will own the park features located on the respective land that they own or have rights to. There are two exceptions to this structure. The Rush Creek Regional Trail and the operations and maintenance facility will be owned by Three Rivers but on land owned by the City of Brooklyn Park. The city will provide property rights to Three Rivers via an easement, permit or lease to ensure there are no conflicts with ownership, operations or use.

Who will operate the facility?

Three Rivers will operate all improvements.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Consistent with Three Rivers policy, Mississippi Gateway Regional Park will be free and open to the public to explore and enjoy. The vision of the park is to create a gateway to the Mississippi River so all people can access and connect with the river. Park neighbors, as well as members of the public from around the region and the state, will use and benefit from the park and its planned improvements. When fully redeveloped, visitation to Mississippi Gateway Regional Park is anticipated to triple, reaching 600,000 visits annually. While current visitors are generally satisfied with the park offerings, additional work is needed to ensure all people feel welcome and comfortable in the park and in natural settings. This is especially true with community groups often underrepresented in regional, nature-based parks (people of color, people with an annual household income of less than \$50,000 and seniors). The plans for Mississippi Gateway Regional Park focus on making the transition from the social, vibrant, developed areas of the park to the quiet, more remote and undeveloped portions of the park feel safe, comfortable and welcoming. The intent of this park is to connect people to nature in a manner in which they are comfortable, ultimately transforming novice park visitors into environmental stewards. Focusing on supporting and encouraging use of the park by underrepresented community groups is critical to serving the immediate area where the park is located. The majority of park visitors (75%) will come from within a 15-minute drive time. The communities surrounding the park have a higher density of underrepresented demographic groups than the greater region. With its location on and access to the Mississippi River, park visitation is anticipated to have a significant regional/statewide draw as well.

Public Purpose

Mississippi Gateway Regional Park is located on one of our nation's most important natural and cultural treasures: the Mississippi River. Much of the river's shoreline in suburban Hennepin County is privately held— making this publicly held parkland absolutely critical to providing access and opportunity to experience the river for all people. The park is envisioned as a steppingstone into nature. Portions of the park will be more developed and comfortable for people with limited experience or exposure to nature and portions will be minimally developed to better serve people looking for a more "off the beaten path" experience. The intent is that this park introduces people to nature in a very gradual manner and that over time, they become comfortable in natural environments and

environmental stewards.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Jason McGrew-King
Intergovernmental Relations and Communications Supervisor
763-559-6779
jason.mcgrew-king@threeriversparks.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$8.5 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

Three Rivers Park District

Project Detail

(\$ in thousands)

Mississippi Gateway Regional Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$8,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$2,145 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$4,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$13,055 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$1,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$5,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$78 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$23,892 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$730 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$30,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Water Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | GO | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 3,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Water Treatment Facility Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$3,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Tower is applying on behalf of the Tower Breitung Wastewater Board and are requesting \$3,000,000 in state funds to upgrade our water treatment facility.**Project Description**

The City of Tower and the Tower Breitung Wastewater Board (TBWWB) are upgrading the water treatment facility to meet Department of Health drinking water standards. Improvements will include Water Treatment Plant Improvements, Abandonment of existing wells, Improvements to existing wells, and replacement of the main service line to the City of Tower.

Project Rationale

The Minnesota Department of Health has recently identified potentially harmful levels of disinfection byproducts (DBP) in the water distribution system. These DBP's are typically a result of the chemical interaction of chlorine with natural organic material (such as naturally occurring tannins and other organic material) in the source water. These organic materials are not easily removed by a conventional iron/manganese removal WTP such as the City's current filtration plant. MDH issued an operational evaluation level exceedance for DBP's, which set in motion a public notification phase, followed by an enhanced testing and monitoring program, along with a requirement for an operational evaluation.

Project Timeline

Pilot Testing Summer 2019
 Engineering Plans & Specifications Summer 2020
 Bid Project Spring 2021
 Award Contract Spring 2021
 Begin Construction Summer 2021
 End Construction Fall 2022

Other Considerations

Tests were recently made at the water plant that detected microbes that could make someone sick. Any time a pathogen is detected in water, there is a possibility that individuals could become sick from drinking the water. The level of concern is higher when pathogens are detected versus indicator organisms (which cannot make people sick from drinking water but do indicate a pathway to contamination), when there are multiple detections when concentrations are elevated, and/or when a pathogen is cultured or observed with a microscope. Results for the wells showed that we meet one or more criteria for a higher level of concern.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The TBWWB will be responsible for annual operation and maintenance costs.

Who will own the facility?

Tower Breitung Wastewater Board

Who will operate the facility?

Tower Breitung Wastewater Board

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The residents and businesses of the City of Tower and the Township of Breitung.

Public Purpose

To provide safe drinking water to the community.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Linda Keith
City Clerk Treasurer
218-753-4070
linda@cityoftower.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Treatment Facility Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$3,900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| County Courthouse | 1 | GO | 5,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

County Courthouse

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$5,100

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: \$5.1 million in state funds is requested to design, construct, furnish and equip a new building for the Traverse County Courthouse courtroom and offices to be located in Wheaton, Minnesota.

Project Description

The existing courthouse will be demolished and a new courthouse will be built in the same location, as it is currently located between Social Services and Law Enforcement. Currently, the Courthouse is a three level building and the new design is a one level building. The new courthouse will feature a flexible, modern office building allowing the county to make operational changes as needed and required. It will allow for an energy-efficient, well-insulated building, modern HVAC system with heating, cooling, fresh air, and temperature control. The courthouse can operate with security having only one public entrance. The total cost estimate of the project is approximately \$5,687,000.00. The square footage of the new courthouse will be 15,000. The Traverse County Board of Commissioners are seeking out funding options, they are looking into lease revenue bonds through our County's HRA and general obligation referendum bonds.

Project Rationale

It is the responsibility of the county to provide and conduct such services and other statutory requirements related to real property, taxes, court functions, and all other related government functions of a county. The existing Traverse County courthouse has major safety, security, and service challenges and issues that are not able to be solved with our current facilities.

The existing Courthouse was built in 1891 but has undergone several additions, remodeling's, and renovations. The courthouse has major structural concerns, the stone foundation was built without a footing causing settling with cracks, the mortar between stones has turned to sand or missing, creating voids between stones. Foundation no longer serves as a continuous ridged beam. The North end of the building is tied together with a steel rod extending through the building and secured at each end on the outside with plates and nuts. Joints on the north wall are severely eroded causing severe water infiltration. Bricks have fallen out of header above windows. Several windows have been removed and filled with studs and solid painted plywood, giving the building a boarded-up look. Original rafters are undersized for the span causing the roof to sag. Rafter tails rotated upwards pulling wood soffit and decorative elements away from the brick. The second-floor window headers have cracks or loose brick and there is evidence of weakened structural integrity. Other major concerns are efficiency, the configuration of the building and construction type places limits on how a remodeling/expansion program could be accomplished. A shortage of adequate work and storage space for the departments housed in the building exists. The basement has leaked since the building was constructed and has developed mold. The walls are uninsulated and windows are single-glazed panes which makes it costly to operate. The security is an issue, the public can enter by multiple unobserved entrances and currently, there is not a separate circulation system for prisoners, nor is

there a true private circulation system, this is among other security issues. Fire protection is an issue, all interior wall finishes are made of unprotected combustible materials and there is no automatic fire suppression system.

The Traverse County Board of Commissioners has done extensive research and they support the construction of a new Traverse County Courthouse, believing that a new courthouse would resolve major safety, security, and service challenges that the existing one has and believes that it is in the best interests of the residents of Traverse County that such a project be authorized.

Project Timeline

Schematic Design – June, July 2020
Design Development – August, September, October 2020
Construction Documents – November, December 2020, January 2021
Procurement – February 2021
Construction – March 2021 through May 2022

Other Considerations

Traverse County lies on the west central edge of Minnesota. With a population of 3,558, it is the least populous county in Minnesota. It is made up of 4 cities, Browns Valley, Dumont, Tintah and Wheaton. Traverse County is in desperate need of a new courthouse, if awarded this grant, it would take some of the tax burden off of the limited number of taxpayers and allow Traverse County to provide the public with needed services in a secure and safe environment.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Traverse County

Who will operate the facility?

Traverse County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The following offices: County Assessor County Auditor/Treasurer County Recorder Motor Vehicle Veteran Services/Solid Waste/Safety County Extension County Coordinator Building and Grounds Maintenance County Attorney County Probation Court Administration Court Room

Public Purpose

The courthouse serves a critical purpose of serving the public through the Assessor, Auditor/Treasurer, Recorder, Motor Vehicle, Veteran Services, Extension, Probation, Attorney offices and the Courtroom holding civil and criminal proceedings.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Lisa Zahl
HR Director/County Coordinator
320-422-7778

lisa.zahl@co.traverse.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

County Courthouse

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$776 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,876 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,507 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$330 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$440 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$599 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$5,876 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank | Fund | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Twin Lakes Township Water Distribution System | 1 | GO | 10,040 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | GF | 360 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,400 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,040 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 360 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Twin Lakes Township Water Distribution System

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$10,400**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: State funding of \$10.4 million for Twin Lake Township water distribution system that includes watermain sizes that vary from 6-inch to 14-inch, services to the existing structures, hydrants, metering station, restoration, and a booster station. Funding is sought for past planning, design efforts, construction, construction contingency, and administrative development of water utility for the Township.

Project Description

Twin Lakes Township and the City of Carlton have been working towards extending a municipal water distribution system to serve part of Twin Lakes Township for several decades and at significant expense to the Township. To facilitate this project, the two government entities formed the Carlton/Twin Lakes Joint Water Board several years ago, and have been working together with the unified goal of extending water to serve the proposed service area.

For this project, Twin Lake Township proposes to construct a water distribution system to serve a portion of the township. Components of the recommended project include

Water will be supplied by the City of Carlton. The City currently has a new Water Treatment Plant under construction and has installed a new well.

An application for funding through USDA Rural Development has been submitted. Similarly, a request has been made for the project to be placed on the Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund Project Priority List/Intended Use Plan.

Project Rationale

The project need is to provide a safe reliable water supply for portions of Twin Lakes Township, particularly poor water quality that includes pungent odor and taste issues in private wells, and a general inadequate water supply volume.

Water Quality Issues

In general, water quality in the service area is undesirable for human consumption. The Carlton County Transportation Building, which houses several government departments, has a drilled well drawing water from the same aquifer. Individuals in that building have long avoided drinking the water because it both smells and has an unpleasant taste. Continued water tested over years has failed to identify the contaminant causing these concerns.

A report of sampling of water for most of the service area homes in 2017 indicated that “During sampling of the water for this project, it was evident from the smell that the overall water quality is undesirable for human consumption throughout much of the service area.”

Inadequate Water Quantity

Water security—obtaining an adequate supply of water—is also a significant concern for both residents and businesses located in Twin Lakes Township. Both suffer from inconsistent and diminishing supplies from groundwater sources. Individual wells do not provide sufficient fire-fighting capacity, putting properties and residents at risk.

Whether due to the presence of shallow bedrock, poor aquifer or other reasons, many of the residents and businesses in the Twin Lakes Township service area have struggled to install shallow or deep wells that can deliver enough water to adequately supply even a small household. Businesses that may require a larger flow rate of water are even more challenged.

A survey of wells in the service area was conducted and showed that many of the wells in the area, including those from Olsonville, the Highway 210 corridor and Schmitz Road have inadequate water yield and excessive drawdown during pumping. Two wells yield less than 1 gallon per minute. The survey quantifies the fact that the wells in the service area have inadequate flowrates to properly serve these properties. In one case, a business owner along Highway 210 has installed 7 wells and still cannot supply enough water to their building to operate their business efficiently.

Project Timeline

Engineering Plans and Specifications Completed September 2019

Bid Project: February 2020

Award Contract: April 2020

Begin Construction: May/June 2020

End Construction: July 2021

Other Considerations**Impact on State Operating Subsidies**

The local government unit does not intend to request new or additional state operating funds for the proposed water system facilities.

Who will own the facility?

Twin Lakes Township

Who will operate the facility?

Twin Lakes Township

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Twin Lakes Township

Public Purpose

Providing a safe, reliable water supply to residents of Twin Lakes Township.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not applicable.

Project Contact Person

Susan Chapin
Clerk
218-384-8166
CLERK@TWINLAKESTOWNSHIP.COM

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Twin Lakes Township Water Distribution System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,040 | \$0 | \$0 |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$360 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$50 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$960 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,390 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$10,400 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | No |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | No |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | No |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Two Harbors Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements | 1 | GO | 11,341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 11,341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 11,341 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Two Harbors Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

AT A GLANCE**2020 Request Amount:** \$11,341**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** We are requesting an estimated \$11,341,000 in state funds for half of the total project costs for design and construction improvements to the City of Two Harbors Wastewater Treatment Facility.**Project Description**

Improvements to the wastewater treatment facility include construction of a new activated sludge biological treatment system and mercury removal improvements. This includes new aeration basins, final clarifiers, biosolids treatment units, mercury filter backwash supply tank, operations and controls building, and associated electrical and controls equipment. The total cost for these improvements is estimated at \$18.0M-\$23.0M. Local funding for the project will be generated by increases in user rates.

Project Rationale

Castle Danger Brewery has created a tremendous economic boom for Two Harbors. This economic growth that is helping create a vibrant and healthy North Shore community is threatened by the aging sewer plant infrastructure, the capacity limitations and the ever looming threat of a moratorium on new sewer connections.

Two Harbors is a small town and without state bonding the cost of the project would mean excessive user fee increases, which our community could not financially support. We do understand that we need to participate to resolve this infrastructure issue.

Further, a recent effluent mercury limit has led to the installation of filters that cannot withstand increased capacity leading to unreliable treatment at the sewer facility resulting in bypass events. The improvements are necessary to protect Lake Superior and to provide reliable treatment to support local residents and businesses.

This project would not only support the local economy through the city's partnership with Castle Danger Brewery, but would also provide the city with the opportunity to partner with Silver Creek Township to help the Township solve their own wastewater treatment issues. The project would pave the way for connection of a portion of Silver Creek Township to the city's system which would eliminate failing septic systems that are currently polluting Lake Superior.

Project Timeline

Design of the project is complete and plans and specifications were submitted to the MPCA in March, 2019. Based on discussions with the MPCA we anticipate that the project will be certified by the MPCA by June 30, 2019.

Construction is planned to start in fall of 2020 with final completion expected for summer of 2023.

Other Considerations

NA

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None anticipated

Who will own the facility?

City of Two Harbors

Who will operate the facility?

City of Two Harbors

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Two Harbors

Public Purpose

Wastewater Treatment/Natural Resource Protection

Description of Previous Appropriations

NA

Project Contact Person

DAN WALKER
CITY ADMINISTRATOR
218-834-5631
dwalker@twoharborsmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Two Harbors Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$11,341 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$1,103 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Funding | \$0 | \$9,138 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,103 | \$21,579 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$43 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$1,060 | \$1,005 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$17,891 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,683 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,103 | \$21,579 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Trunk Sanitary Sewer Improvements | 1 | GO | 4,444 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 4,444 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 4,444 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Trunk Sanitary Sewer Improvements**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$4,444**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$4 million in state bond funding to design and construct a trunk sanitary sewer improvement, lift station, and associated street repair in the City of Tyler. In addition to eliminating raw sewage from backing up into residential homes, the trunk sanitary sewer will also allow for the construction of a new regional high school and medical center.**Project Description**

The City of Tyler is committed to providing safe and reliable public works facilities. The Trunk Sanitary Sewer Project includes 4,470 LF of 24" pipe, 4,240 LF of 21" pipe, 1,700 LF of 18" pipe, 1,300 LF of 10" pipe, 100 LF of 8" pipe to the west side of the City of Tyler, 1,800 LF of 6" service pipe, a new lift station, and road repairs where disturbed by the trunk sanitary sewer project. The Trunk Sanitary Sewer will be constructed along CSAH 8 from Oak Street to the Wastewater Treatment Facility Ponds on the northwest of town.

The installation of the new Trunk Sanitary Sewer will not only eliminate back ups into residential homes and businesses in the city but will also provide service to the new school and Avera Tyler Medical Facility being built on the west side of the City. A school referendum has been passed to fund the construction of the new school. Avera Marshall Medical Group is working on the planning phase of the new hospital construction.

Project Rationale

Tyler is a city of Lincoln County, Minnesota, with a population of 1,143 at the 2010 census. The City is centrally located between the Russell, Ruthton, Lake Benton, Ivanhoe, Pipestone and Marshall Areas attracting a large amount of traffic along US Highway 14.

The City of Tyler is currently working with Avera Tyler for the development of a new facility. Its central location for the Avera Marshall Medical Group, which manages Avera Tyler, as the only medical facility in a 30-mile radius. The facility provides 24-hour emergency service as well as home healthcare service, clinic service and more to the population in the 30-mile service area.

The RTR School District serves the Russell, Tyler and Ruthton communities along with the surrounding areas. The district serves an area of approximately 298 square miles with a current enrollment of 643 students. The Russell-Tyler-Ruthton School District is served by three buildings spread out across the district. The buildings are in poor condition and a portion of the high school has been deemed unsafe for use. The new school will allow elementary, middle and high school services to be collocated in one facility which will reduce operational costs and provide improved educational opportunities.

The district voted and passed a \$35 million referendum for construction of the new school facility.

The selected site for the school was chosen to take advantage of existing transportation infrastructure. With the hospital looking to develop the neighboring property, the site also serves as a strong opportunity for both the Hospital and School to work together in education opportunities for the students. The site has adequate space for future expansion if needed to meet community growth and changing educational trends.

In addition to transportation infrastructure, the new sewer on site is a big part of why the school and medical facility have selected to be located in the City of Tyler. The project has the potential to have a larger economic impact by providing educational opportunities to high school students that are not currently available that will translate into job skills that attract employers. The new sanitary sewer and existing transportation infrastructure will also open up additional commercial development opportunities along a rail line and close to Highway 14 where these new job skills can be used. Without this sewer project, it would be impossible to envision these opportunities for continued community vitality and growth.

Project Timeline

Construction is expected to begin summer 2020 with completion July 2022.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Tyler

Who will operate the facility?

City of Tyler

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Public Purpose

The City of Tyler's construction of the trunk sanitary sewer provide reliable sanitary service by correcting the existing problems that result in sewage backups into homes and businesses. The project will also provide opportunity for construction of the new Russell-Tyler-Ruthton (RTR) school building and the new Avera Tyler Marshall Medical Center. The opportunity to save operational costs to the school district while providing improved educational opportunities will be an economic driver to the community and the region. The new school and new hospital facility will improve livability of the community. The existing transportation infrastructure with the new sanitary sewer line and improved community livability will attract businesses to the area. Without this sewer project, it would be impossible to envision any of this development.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This application has not received previous appropriations

Project Contact Person

Joan Jagt

507-247-5556

cityadmin@heartlandpower.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Sanitary Sewer Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$4,444 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,444 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$444 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,444 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | No |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Water Infrastructure Improvements | 1 | GO | 7,984 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 7,984 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 7,984 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Water Infrastructure Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2020 Request Amount: \$7,984

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The proposed project will allow the City to complete the replacement of the remaining water distribution so the City can fill the water tower completely to provide supply during high demand periods and to provide fire protection. The replacement of the sewer collection system and storm sewer system will allow for storm water correction and protect the WWTF from excess flows, removing the need to bypass sending raw sewage to the Blue Earth River.

Project Description

In 2015, the City of Vernon Center completed \$2.5 million of infrastructure improvements which included a new refurbished water tower and replacement of 20% to 25% of the wastewater collection and water distribution systems. The existing water tower was beyond repair due to age and height (inadequate pressure) and the collection and distribution systems were in extremely poor condition. It was during this project, as the pipes were removed from the ground, that the City saw firsthand the seriousness of the situation. The water main lines were filled with iron solids and the pipes were severely corroded and easily collapsed when any pressure was placed on them (stepped on). Due to the poor condition of the sewer collection system, inflow and infiltration (I/I) was very high, causing annual bypasses at the wastewater treatment facility (WWTF). On Oct. 7th, Mayor Ziegler & staff met with MPCA to review their draft of a schedule of compliance they will be finalizing in 2019.

The Project includes wastewater collection, water distribution, storm sewer system and improvements to the WWTF and upgrades needed due to tighter permit effluent limits for phosphorus. Replacement of the water treatment plant (WTP) is also included. The building, dates back to the early 1900's, no insulation, dehumidification nor proper ventilation and no longer meets safety requirements for chemical storage/use. Replacement with new is recommended.

Included Project Costs:

- **Wastewater Treatment System** : Replace aged and failing equipment at facility including, electrical, piping, clarifier and UV disinfection. Provide chemical feed and new clarifier to meet NPDES permit for phosphorus. Keep existing treatment system, C license operator, low operation & maintenance costs, no annual solids handling. **Costs: \$1,232,950**
- **Wastewater Collection System**: Replace existing gravity with new gravity (in kind), easy to maintain and operate, reline where possible, low operating costs. **Costs: \$2,022,800**
- **Water Treatment System**: Replace existing water plant with new gravity filtration plant. **Costs: \$2,764,300**
- **Water Distribution System**: Replace aged infrastructure to maintain reliable and safe water supply. No expansion of system is proposed **Costs: \$1,813,500**

- **Storm Sewer System:** Storm is aged and has cross connections with sanitary sewer, inundating the WWTF with flow. Replace storm sewer with other proposed improvements. **Costs: \$1,533,100**
- **Ineligible Street Improvements:** Replace remaining portion of street outside replaced utilities and improve to modern construction standards. **Costs: \$2,309,700**

Total Estimated Project Cost \$11,676,350

Potential sources USDA-RD, PFA, GO Bond and State Bonding (Gap need).

Funding estimated (prior to knowing what USDA-RD would provide for a funding package)

| Item | Estimated Cost | Grant | Loan | Other | Source | % Eligible |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|---|------------|
| County Street and Storm | \$1,693,100 | \$1,693,100 | | | State Aid - per Blue Earth County Cost Share Policy | |
| City Ineligible Costs | \$616,600 | | \$616,600 | | Assessments and / or Property Taxes and/or other | |
| USDA - RD Wastewater System Eligible | \$2,441,813 | \$2,441,813 | | | USDA - RD Grant | 75% |
| | \$813,938 | | \$813,938 | | USDA - RD Loan | 25% |
| USDA - RD Water System Eligible | \$3,433,350 | \$3,433,350 | | | USDA - RD Grant | 75% |
| | \$1,144,450 | | \$1,144,450 | | USDA - RD Loan | 25% |
| USDA - RD Storm Sewer Eligible | \$1,533,100 | | \$1,533,100 | | USDA - RD Loan | 100% |
| Total | \$11,676,350 | \$7,568,263 | \$4,108,088 | | | |
| Funding estimated after USDA-RD identified what they could provide | | | | | | |
| Item | Estimated Cost | Grant | Loan | Shortage | Source | % Eligible |
| County Street and Storm | \$1,693,100 | \$1,693,100 | | | State Aid - per Blue Earth County Cost Share Policy | |
| City Ineligible Costs | \$616,600 | | | \$616,600 | Assessments and / or Property Taxes and/or other | |
| DEED Grant | | \$600,000 | | | Deed Grant | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------|
| | | | | | Infrastructure (assume for sewer) | |
| U S D A - R D Wastewater System Eligible | \$3,255,750 | | \$700,000 | \$1,955,750 | U S D A - R D Grant | 75% |
| | | | | | U S D A - R D Loan | 25% |
| U S D A - R D Water System Eligible | \$4,577,800 | | \$700,000 | \$3,877,800 | U S D A - R D Grant | 75% |
| | | | | | U S D A - R D Loan | 25% |
| U S D A - R D Storm Sewer Eligible | \$1,533,100 | | | \$1,533,100 | U S D A - R D Loan | 100% |
| Total | \$11,676,350 | \$2,293,100 | \$1,400,000 | \$7,983,250 | | |

Project Rationale

Due to such a small population and spreading the cost of more than \$11.6 million dollars plus inflation costs over 165 meters as user fees and/or adding a yearly levy to pay off the entire amount would be extremely burdensome and truly economically unaffordable for Vernon Center and its residents. Our request for \$6 million in State Bonding would help to make Vernon Center's portion more economically viable. Using USDA RD funding for the rest of the project over 40 years allows the city to do its part in a reasonable, economical and affordable manner. Without this funding, the city cannot meet its environmental obligations, safe water for its residents and remain a viable and economical choice for our residents in the future. These funds would ensure our community's future and comply with environmental regulations that the City wants to comply with.

Project Timeline

Project Schedule and Timeline

| | |
|--|---|
| August 16, 2018 | Public Hearing |
| August 24, 2018 | USDA-RD: PER/ER Completion; submittal to USDA-RD |
| August 2018–January 2019 | USDA-RD: PER/ER Review (6 months) |
| April 2019 USDA-RD: | Funding Obligation |
| May 2019–October 2019 USDA-RD: | Preliminary Engineering Design (6 months) |
| November 2019–January 2020 USDA-RD: | Engineering Review (3-6 months) |
| February 2020–July 2020 USDA-RD: | Final Engineering Design (6 months) |
| August 2020 USDA-RD: | Legal Review |
| September 2020–December:2020 USDA-RD: | Legal/Engineering Approval (3-6 months) |
| January 2021 | Bidding |
| February 2021 | Award Projects |
| April 2021 | Start Projects |
| November 2021 | Substantially Complete Street Project |
| October 2022 | Substantially Complete WTP and WWTF |
| December 2022 | Final Completion |

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

n/a

Who will own the facility?

City of Vernon Center

Who will operate the facility?

City of Vernon Center Staff

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of Vernon Center

Public Purpose

The project purpose is to deliver safe drinking water, environmentally discharge our wastewater and storm sewers while complying with state regulations. In addition to make sure there is adequate water pressure aiding in fire protection. At this time, we cannot use our fire hydrants due to lack of water pressure and our water mains breaking.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Diane Roelofs
Clerk-Treasurer
507-549-3240
VcClerk18@gmail.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Water Infrastructure Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$7,984 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$580 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,419 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,693 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,676 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$138 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$310 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$9,988 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$11,676 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Regional Fire-Based Emergency Medical Services and Public Safety Facility | 1 | GO | 10,390 | 0 | 0 | 10,390 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,390 | 0 | 0 | 10,390 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,390 | 0 | 0 | 10,390 | 0 | 0 |

Regional Fire-Based Emergency Medical Services and Public Safety Facility**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$10,390**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The City of Virginia is requesting \$10.39 million in state funds for site acquisition construction and development for a new Regional Fire-Based Emergency Medical Services and Public Safety Facility**Project Description**

The City of Virginia is requesting \$10,390,000 in state funding to acquire, demolish existing structures, develop a site, and construction of a Regional Fire-Based Emergency Medical Services and Public Safety Facility. The current Virginia Fire and Police Departments are located in the City of Virginia, in St. Louis County, approximately 200 miles north of St. Paul.

The Fire Department serves an EMS geographical area of 900 square miles with a population of 68,000 and a Fire Service (primary and mutual aid) territory of approximately 650 square miles. The current Fire Department is housed in one two story fire station facility. This historic building was constructed in 1907 to serve the needs of the bustling City. The first addition was placed in 1914 with another addition in the late 1980s. As the number of calls in both Fire and EMS have increased, the staffing at the station is has increased proportionally. The station is occupied 24 hours per day, 7 days a week with three shifts of 9 (FTE) firefighter/paramedics working a 24 hour shift to offer continuous coverage. The needs for relocation are immediate due to structural deficiencies, ADA deficiencies, and constriction of space.

The Virginia Police Department is located in the City Hall which was constructed in the 1920's. The Police Department currently houses 25 FTE Officers and administrative staff also 7 days a week, 24 hours per day. The Police Department serves a population of approximately 9,000 residents and responds to approximately 15000 calls a year within it's 12 square miles of jurisdiction. Due to lack of ability to expand, remodeling has not been possible thus the building has not kept up with technology. Rooms have been renovated to the best of their ability but lack of storage, office space, and parking as well as security and safety concerns require the staff and to seek new location for the Police Department.

A new 60,000 square foot facility would allow the City to relocate both the Fire and Police departments, add a large community room to be used for Regional Training in fire, EMS, and Emergency Operations, as well as other community needs, and a backup Emergency Operations Center in case of large scale disasters. The former Fire Hall would be demolished after new facility was constructed. The former Police Department would be repurposed for use by City Offices currently housed on the 2nd floor of City Hall. This would allow the City to lease underutilized office space to private firms.

Total funding for this project is estimated at \$25.69 million.

Project Rationale

The Virginia Fire & Regional EMS Service has continually experienced growth, thus necessitating

growth in equipment and staff. The need for relocation has become immediate. Structural deficiencies do not allow equipment purchases to occur, ADA deficiencies limit the types of trainings to be conducted on site, and lack of space makes for difficult situations when staff of all genders work 24/7 in a facility that was constructed over 100 years ago.

The Virginia Police Department has seen the lack of ability to expand to accommodate technology and to meet requirements for storage. Rooms have been renovated to the best of their ability but lack of storage, office space, and parking as well as security and safety concerns require the staff and to seek new location for the Police Department.

Project Timeline

Other Considerations

The City has sought Federal legislation on this project.

The acquisition areas for this project would ideally be targeted as blighted areas. It would be the intent of the City to acquire blight properties with the intent to remove all structures in order to accommodate the construction. Due to this process, the timeline may change.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Virginia

Who will operate the facility?

City of Virginia

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Virginia Fire and Regional EMS Service Virginia Police Department Community members Area Fire & EMS departments

Public Purpose

The Public Purpose would be to ensure safety and health of the public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Britt See-Benes
City Administrator
218-749-3957
britts@virginiamn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$10.39 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Regional Fire-Based Emergency Medical Services and Public Safety Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,390 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$9,950 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$300 | \$300 | \$0 |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$4,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$25,390 | \$300 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$3,077 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$19,813 | \$300 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$25,390 | \$300 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| PV Installation and Solar Energy Learning Center | 1 | GF | 435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Fund Cash (GF) Total | | | 435 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

PV Installation and Solar Energy Learning Center**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$435**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$435,000 in bonding dollars is requested to install solar panels on a new recreation facility and construct a Solar Energy Learning Center which monitors real time production, consumption and storage from the PV system.**Project Description**

A Community Recreation Center was opened in December 2018. Partnerships with the Otto Bremer Foundation, US Bank, WAO Sport Booster Club and the City of Warren helped to build the \$1.1 Million facility. The WAO School District provided the land for the facility. The facility is open year around 24/7. There are an average of 30 visitors a day ranging in age from 1-80. The city of Warren, through the Climate Smart Municipalities Partnership, has learned to look at efficiency and sustainability with each new project. With the facility, Warren would like to install solar panels to continue the sustainability effort. The cost for the PV panels and the installation will be \$175,000. The panels will generate 40 KW of energy. The state of the art storage system and software to monitor demand peaks will costs \$100,000. A 25 x 25 foot room will be constructed that would house the learning center which will cost \$100,000. The center will contain the software and monitors to view real-time production, consumption and the storage capacities for the PV system. There will be monitors and poster boards explaining the facility and where the energy is being used within the facility. There will also be a section with a demonstration on insulation and energy efficiencies. The cost of the monitoring system and education materials is \$60,000. This solar learning center will provide the information needed for the region to begin looking at solar energy has an option for their homes and businesses. There are a large number of school age children who use the facility and educating them will provide a societal change in the region.

Project Rationale

The City of Warren is in the fourth year of participating in the Smart Climate Partnership with Germany. With that project, the city has learned the necessity of constructing buildings using renewable energy and energy efficiencies. The rationale for this facility would be to create a model for other small cities to emulate using renewable energy. There is not a facility in the Northwest region of Minnesota that has a solar panel installation. Warren has been a pioneer and regional leader in sustainability efforts for a small city. It would be a natural progression to develop a learning center. There is a huge need in the region to educate the public on solar energy. There is a lot of misinformation on solar and a center will provide an actual hands on facility where people can actually see solar energy working. Germany is further north than Minnesota and there is a lot of solar in the country.

Project Timeline

July 1, 2020 - Funding cycle begins and bid packages are created
 August 1, 2020 - Advertise for bids

September 1, 2020 - Award bids, begin working on educational panels
October 1, 2020 - Begin PV panel installation and construction of learning center
December 1, 2020 - Begin installation of all monitoring equipment
December 31, 2020 - Completion date

Other Considerations

Climate change is happening. We need to begin changing minds. Renewable energy is not received in northwest Minnesota because of misinformation. Warren has been a first in many things in regards to clean energy. It is time to be a first in the change of way of thinking. You must support a hands on learning center to change people. The solar learning center will successfully change people.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There is no impact on State Operating Subsidies.

Who will own the facility?

City of Warren

Who will operate the facility?

City of Warren

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be used by area residents of all ages. There will not be any entity leasing the facility or occupying any space. The facility is for recreation to allow a place for people to socialize and provide activity. It is a year around facility open 24 hours.

Public Purpose

The building was constructed with municipal funds which allows for the public to use the facility. It is opened and operated by a municipal government entity and the purpose is to allow residents to use the facility for little or no fees.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous appropriations have been received.

Project Contact Person

Shannon Mortenson
City Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer
218-745-5343
shannonm@warrenminnesota.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

PV Installation and Solar Energy Learning Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Fund Cash | \$0 | \$435 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | \$730 | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$270 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$1,000 | \$435 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$1,000 | \$435 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,000 | \$435 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|-----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Trunk Highway 36 and CSAH 15 (Manning Avenue) Interchange Project | 1 | THB | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4th Street Bridge with Metro Gold Line in Oakdale | 2 | GO | 3,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park Lower Landing Project | 3 | GO | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 |
| St. Croix Bluffs Regional Park Boat Launch | 4 | GO | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 21,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 |
| Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total | | | 15,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 |

Trunk Highway 36 and CSAH 15 (Manning Avenue) Interchange Project**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$15,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** Washington County is requesting \$15 million in state funds for the construction and land acquisition for a new interchange and frontage road at the intersection of TH 36 and CSAH 15 located in the cities of Stillwater, Oak Park Heights, Lake Elmo, Grant and Stillwater Township.**Project Description**

Washington County is leading the Trunk Highway (TH) 36 and CSAH 15 (Manning Avenue) Interchange Project, in cooperation with MnDOT, the cities of Stillwater, Grant, Lake Elmo, and Oak Park Heights, and Stillwater Township. The project location is the existing at-grade signalized intersection of TH 36 and Manning Avenue. TH 36 is a principal arterial roadway that runs east-west approximately 20 miles in length from I-35W in Roseville to the Wisconsin border at Stillwater. TH 36 provides a connection with Wisconsin State Highway 35 via the St. Croix Crossing Bridge, which opened in late 2017. The St. Croix Crossing Bridge connects TH 36 with Wisconsin, and acts as a regional gateway.

Washington County has secured \$7 million in federal funds for the TH 36/Manning interchange project through the 2016 Regional Solicitation process. These funds must be spent by 2021 or the county will have to return the funds to the federal government. The county has committed \$6 million dollars to this project. The cities and townships have committed a total of \$2 million dollars. The remaining project partner is the State of Minnesota, which has not yet committed any funds to this major transportation project that will improve regional safety and capacity.

Within the project area, TH 36 is a four-lane divided expressway section. North of TH 36, Manning Avenue is a four-lane roadway and classified as an A-Minor Expander. Manning Avenue is the primary regional roadway connecting southern Chisago County and northern Washington County to TH 36. Development and the opening of the St. Croix Crossing Bridge in 2017 has resulted in traffic volumes are exceeding the capacity of the at-grade intersection in extended periods of heavy congestion, an increase in accidents, and an unacceptable level of peak hour service.

The project addresses a regional safety concern while preserving existing capacity along TH 36 by constructing an interchange at the existing signalized intersection and adding a frontage road south of TH 36 to make a local connection to Manning Avenue. This project eliminates an at-grade intersection along TH 36 and helps achieve the freeway vision of this important interregional corridor. The interchange design does not preclude the expansion of TH 36 from four to six lanes, if desired by the region in the future. This project will be combined with local street improvements to enhance traffic safety in the corridor. The existing frontage road north of TH 36 will be designed to accommodate the new interchange design. To maximize efficiency for regional traffic flow, reduce traffic conflict points, and to minimize or eliminate local municipal cost share, relocation or elimination of the southern neighborhood street connection will be considered during the course of project development.

Project Rationale

The existing intersection is an impediment to consistent interregional corridor speeds of 55 mph and safe travel. Removing the traffic signal at the intersection will allow TH 36 through-trucks to maintain speed, resulting in improved capacity and reduce travel time and congestion. These improvements will increase corridor safety. Supplementary to through-traffic movement, the new auxiliary lanes between the east ramps of the proposed interchange, and the west ramps of the TH 5 interchange to the east, will balance the traffic load (alleviate truck/vehicle conflicts) and maintain a more uniform TH 36 level of service. Roadway grade-separation projects reduce system vulnerability by promoting system security and eliminate crash risk exposure, which benefit motorized and non-motorized users alike. The project also preserves the structural integrity (10-ton rated) and smoothness of the pavement, which benefits freight by reducing the number of goods damaged in transit; improving operating and maintenance costs, and reducing driver fatigue.

Expected redevelopment along the corridor in Stillwater and Oak Park Heights will bring jobs to the community, as well as access to them. In particular, Stillwater has been coordinating with Stillwater Township over the last 20 years on an annexation and staging plan for urban development along Manning Avenue. The NE corner of the intersection has been purchased by Lakeview Hospital and is planned for land uses which would provide living wage jobs. Access to this area has been managed in anticipation of an interchange. Therefore, the proposed interchange would improve accessibility to this job center, enhance connections between developments, and provide improved access to Stillwater and northern Washington County.

The proposed grade-separated crossing over TH 36 would allow bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities to safely cross a formidable barrier in the community, with its many lanes and high speed approaches (55 mph), without interrupting regional traffic or waiting for a walk signal. The existing crossing distance (>150') drastically increases a pedestrian's exposure to traffic, which is particularly problematic to disabled or elderly pedestrians (many of whom may have compromised balance or use motorized wheelchairs to navigate the area). Improving the crossing for young residents is also important because of their small size, inability to judge speeds, and lack of experience with traffic rules, putting them at greater risk for injury or death from traffic collisions. The grade-separated crossing will provide non-motorized users with greater separation from vehicular traffic, be ADA-compliant, and wide enough to allow for comfortable bi-directional use.

This critical project has substantial carry-over benefits to the freight system. The location of the project on Minnesota's Principal Freight Network means it is inherently valuable, and will strongly benefit freight movements, more so than projects on other routes. Specifically, this project improves the safety and efficiency of freight movement by constructing an interchange at Manning Avenue.

The project does not impose adverse human health or environmental effects on existing populations. Project construction will incorporate proper noise, dust, and traffic mitigation and will not negatively impact populations present in the project area.

Project Timeline

- Pre-design: through Fall 2019
- Final Design: Fall/Winter 2020
- Begin construction: 2021
- Construction Complete: 2022

Other Considerations

Washington County has already secured \$7 million in federal funding through the 2016 Regional Solicitation process for this project which must be spent by 2021. The county and cities have almost committed funds to this project. The state is the only project partner that has not committed funds to this project that improves regional safety and efficiency.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The TH 36 and Manning Interchange project will improve capacity, congestion and travel time. The construction of the interchange will accommodate the growing traffic volumes including the increase in users from the opening of the St. Croix Crossing Bridge. The grade separation of the interchange will allow users on TH 36 to travel more efficiently through the corridor. This project will improve safety and accessibility in the corridor for motorized and non-motorized users of all ages and abilities.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT will own the bridge and ramp facilities. County and city roads will connect to the ramp and bridge facilities.

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT will operate the bridge and ramp facilities. County and city roads will be operated by their respective entity.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The interchange and frontage road will be used by the public.

Public Purpose

The TH 36 and Manning Interchange project will improve capacity, congestion and travel time. The construction of the interchange will accommodate the growing traffic volumes including the increase in users from the opening of the St. Croix Crossing Bridge. The grade separation of the interchange will allow users and freight on TH 36 to travel more efficiently through the corridor. This project will improve safety and accessibility in the corridor for motorized and non-motorized users of all ages and abilities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This project has not received any previous appropriations.

Project Contact Person

Nathan Arnold
Engineer II
651-430-4384
nathan.arnold@co.washington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$100 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Road Improvement Program to be awarded by the Department of Transportation based on a competitive application process.

(\$ in thousands)

Trunk Highway 36 and CSAH 15 (Manning Avenue) Interchange Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| Trunk Highway Bonds | \$0 | \$15,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$1,062 | \$4,938 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$1,062 | \$28,938 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$1,062 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$638 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$23,411 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,889 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$1,062 | \$28,938 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | Yes |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

4th Street Bridge with Metro Gold Line in Oakdale**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$3,500**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** Washington County is seeking \$3.5 million in funding for general purpose automobile lanes and pedestrian and bicycle lands on the reconstructed 4th Street Bridge over Interstate I-694 in Oakdale. This reconstruction will be done in conjunction with the METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Project.**Project Description**

The reconstructed bridge across Interstate 694 (I-694) on 4th Street in Oakdale, includes two lanes of general purpose traffic and one ten-foot (minimum) pedestrian and bicycle lane. Two METRO Gold Line Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) lanes will also be constructed and funded in the amount of \$3 M by the METRO Gold Line project, through a Federal Transit Administration Capital Improvement Grant program. This legislative request is for general purpose and pedestrian and bicycle lane, only. The total cost of the reconstructed bridge is \$7.0 M.

The reconstructed bridge will provide a crucial walking and biking connection where one does not exist today. Improved multi-modal connections within Oakdale - and along the future METRO Gold Line - will help leverage planned investments in the area, and ease the burden of freeway barriers created in this Oakdale neighborhood, near the intersection of I-694 and I-94.

Continued and coordinated transportation investments in a congested and rapidly growing corridor benefits the east metro as a whole, and better situates the City of Oakdale to meet their planned goals in 2040 and beyond.

Project Rationale

Without funding Gold Line BRT will operate on the existing two lane bridge structure in mixed traffic. No additional vehicle lanes or bicycle & pedestrian accommodations will be provided. As a result, the near-term opportunity to alleviate a barrier to the Oakdale community will be lost.

Project Timeline

The bridge is being designed in coordination with the METRO Gold Line BRT project. Engineering will advance to 60% in 2020 and be to 100% by the end of 2021. Construction would be in 2022 through 2023.

Other Considerations

Support has come from the City of Oakdale; the Metropolitan Council; Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT); and East Metro Strong. Opposition may come from those opposed to roadway expansion.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The Minnesota Department of Transportation is current owner of the bridge. It is anticipated that MnDOT will remain the owner of the general purpose lanes and bicycle and pedestrian facility and Metro Transit will own the bus rapid transit lanes.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Oakdale operates the existing bridge through an agreement with MnDOT, It is anticipated that the City of Oakdale will remain the operator of the general purpose lanes and bicycle and pedestrian facility through an agreement with MnDOT and Metro Transit will operate the bus rapid transit lanes.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

The facility will be open to the traveling public. It will accommodate bikers, walkers, people in vehicles, and transit riders.

Public Purpose

A reconstructed 4th Street bridge over I-694 will provide a crucial walking and biking connection where one does not exist today. Improved multi-modal connections within Oakdale - and along the future METRO Gold Line - will help leverage planned investments in the area, and ease the burden of freeway barriers created in this Oakdale neighborhood, near the intersection of I-694 and I-94.

Description of Previous Appropriations

This project has not received any previous appropriations.

Project Contact Person

Wayne Sandberg
County Engineer
651-430-4339
wayne.sandberg@co.washington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$112 million in general obligation bonds for the Local Bridge Replacement Program to be awarded to projects on the Department of Transportation's Local Bridge Replacement Waiting List.

(\$ in thousands)

4th Street Bridge with Metro Gold Line in Oakdale

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$3,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$1,650 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$1,850 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$6,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$7,000 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park Lower Landing Project**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$2,000**Priority Ranking:** 3**Project Summary:** Washington County is requesting \$2 million in State bonding to design and construct the Lower Landing Facility Area in Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park. This funding is matched with \$2 million from County bonds and \$844,713 from the Parks and Trail Legacy Fund.**Project Description**

The Lower Landing Facility Area of Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park will be developed to serve the needs of current and future park users of the metropolitan region. A new multi-use facility will include restrooms, storage space, multi-purpose lobby space, office space, equipment staging area, and drain field. Adjacent site area improvements will include picnic shade structures and Ravine Lake fishing pier and canoe/kayak launch access improvements.

Project Rationale

The existing structure in Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park's Lower Landing has passed its service life and continuous repairs are costly and time consuming. The deteriorating building is no longer in acceptable condition to be reserved and it does not provide year-round use. In addition, the shelter and restroom facilities do not meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. As the park develops and visitation increases, there will be more demand for a facility with modern and accessible amenities.

The new multi-use facility and site improvements will be building upon phase 1 of park investments, which included new access roads, trails, parking lots, a playground. The project is consistent with an approved Metropolitan Council Regional Park System master plan. The master plan process included a comprehensive technical and public engagement process and was approved by the Washington County Board of Commissioners and Metropolitan Council.

Washington County is willing to provide \$2 million of bonding to help fund this project, matching the \$2 million request for State bonds. Without state bonding assistance, development of the park is unlikely and the recent investment will be underutilized. State bonding will not only make the project possible but will be much more efficient. Economies of scale can be realized for construction activities of grading, utilities, and buildings.

Project Timeline

September 1, 2015 – March 2, 2017: Master Planning, Public Engagement, County and Metropolitan Council Approvals (Completed)

July 14, 2019: Predesign and Public Engagement

September 1, 2019: Permitting and Final Design

January 1, 2020: Engineering and Design construction document development

June 1, 2020 – November 30, 2020: Construction

Other Considerations

Washington County parks and trails serve both the county and the greater metropolitan region. As the 7-county regional population looks to welcome and additional 700,000 people, Washington County looks forward to welcoming 80,000 new residents. Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park is located in south Washington County, one of the fastest growing areas in the metropolitan area. Families and businesses choose to locate in the county because of the outdoor recreational opportunities and natural beauty our parks and trails provide.

In 2018, residents awarded the Parks system the Top Rated County Service, Top County Characteristic, and the Services and Facilities Most Used by Older Adults. Furthermore, Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park visitation increased by 72% from 2016-2018. We are a well-used and growing system, so we must continue to develop our parks to meet the demand.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park Lower Landing Facility Area will have minimal impact on the State Operating Subsidies. The county finances approximately 91% of the overall operations and maintenance for the regional park and trails it manages. Approximately 9% funding for operations and maintenance comes from the state lottery in lieu of property taxes and general fund from the State. Thus, the county will be responsible for approximately 91% of any impact to operations and maintenance costs generated out from this project.

Who will own the facility?

Washington County will own the facility. As an implementing agency of the Regional Park System, the county owns the park land which facilities would be constructed on.

Who will operate the facility?

Washington County will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park will be staffed by Washington County and used by the public as a part of the Metropolitan Regional Park System. The county and the Metropolitan Regional Park System welcome all visitors to our parks.

Public Purpose

Just as water, sewer, and public safety are considered essential public services, parks are vitally important to establishing and maintaining the quality of life in a community, ensuring the health of families and youth, and contributing to the economic and environmental well-being of a community and a region. Facilities and grounds will be available to the public 365 days a year and provide essential services for the public to connect with nature and enjoy the outdoors.

Description of Previous Appropriations

\$844,713 of Parks & Trails Legacy Fund (SFY 2020-2021)

Project Contact Person

Wayne Sandberg
County Engineer

651-430-4339

wayne.sandberg@co.washington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$2 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Cottage Grove Ravine Regional Park Lower Landing Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$845 | \$0 | \$0 |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,845 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$125 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$291 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$4,429 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$4,845 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | Yes |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | No |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | No |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

St. Croix Bluffs Regional Park Boat Launch**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$500**Priority Ranking:** 4**Project Summary:** Washington County is requesting \$500,000 in state funds to design and construct improvements to the boat launch in St Croix Bluffs Regional Park.**Project Description**

The existing boat launch in St Croix Bluffs Regional Park is deteriorating due to its high use. Repairs to the existing boat launch and corresponding site improvements are needed to provide safe public access to the St Croix National Scenic Riverway.

Washington County has identified solutions that are responsible, cost-effective, and minimize the duration of the launch closure. Boat launch improvements will consist of replacing the bottom portion of the boat launch and reinforcing the launch to prevent lake bed damage from power loading boats. This project will also require dredging the harbor to improve overall boat launch operation. Site improvements will include improving site accessibility and the fishing pier.

Project Rationale

Washington County completed a study on the St. Croix Bluffs Regional Park boat launch in January 2018. The study concluded that the condition of the boat launch is in need of immediate action and the cost of repair is beyond the current financial resources available to the county.

The existing boat launch has passed its service life and continuous repairs are costly and time consuming. The bottom of the boat launch has a steep slope break and the bottom of the ramp has scoured from users power-loading their boats. When water levels are low, users have a difficult time launching their boats with this slope break and scour hole and boat trailers are bottoming out - causing damage to trailers and axles.

As the park develops and visitation increases, there will be more demand for a boat launch with modern and accessible amenities. The boat launch will build upon planned investments in the park, which include improvements to the fishing pier, campground, playgrounds, trails, and wayfinding.

The project is consistent with an approved Metropolitan Council Regional Park System master plan. The master plan process included a comprehensive technical and public engagement process and was approved by the Washington County Board of Commissioners and Metropolitan Council.

St Croix Bluffs Regional Park fronts 4,000 feet of shoreline along the St Croix River, providing access to the federally-recognized wild and scenic river route. Free-flowing and unpolluted, the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway runs through some of the most scenic country in the Upper Midwest. The park provides the only publically managed boat launch south of Bayport, for the St Croix River.

The staff and resources necessary to deliver the boat launch improvements are planned and this

project is being actively worked on. If the \$500,000 of state bonding is not dedicated to Washington County, the proposed project will not proceed. Within five years, the deteriorating condition of the boat launch may force Washington County to close it. State bonding will not only make the project possible but will be much more efficient. Economies of scale can be realized for construction activities of grading, utilities, and buildings.

Project Timeline

September 1, 2020 – July1, 2021: Preliminary and Final Design
October 1, 2021 – December 31, 2021: Construction

Other Considerations

Washington County parks and trails serve both the county and the greater metropolitan region. As the 7-county regional population looks to welcome and additional 700,000 people, Washington County looks forward to welcoming 80,000 new residents. St Croix Bluffs Regional Park is located in south Washington County, one of the fastest growing areas in the metropolitan area. Families and businesses choose to locate in the county because of the outdoor recreational opportunities and natural beauty our parks and trails provide.

In 2018, residents awarded the Parks system the Top Rated County Service, Top County Characteristic, and the Services and Facilities Most Used by Older Adults. We are a well-used and growing system, so we must continue to develop our parks to meet the demand.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Washington County will own the facility. As an implementing agency of the Regional Park System, the county owns the park land which facilities would be constructed on.

Who will operate the facility?

Washington County will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

St Croix Bluffs Regional Park staffed by Washington County and used by the public as a part of the Metropolitan Regional Park System. The county and the Metropolitan Regional Park System welcome all visitors to our parks.

Public Purpose

Just as water, sewer, and public safety are considered essential public services, parks are vitally important to establishing and maintaining the quality of life in a community, ensuring the health of families and youth, and contributing to the economic and environmental well-being of a community and a region.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Wayne Sandberg

County Engineer
651-430-4339
wayne.sandberg@co.washington.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$500,000 in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

St. Croix Bluffs Regional Park Boat Launch

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$900 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | No |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | No |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Wayzata Lake Effect Boardwalk Project | 1 | GO | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 10,000 | 0 | 0 | 10,000 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Wayzata Lake Effect Boardwalk Project**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$10,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$10 million in state funds is requested to design and construct a boardwalk and restore the lake edge on Lake Minnetonka in downtown Wayzata as a part of the Lake Effect Project. The project's goal is to create a more clean, welcoming, and connected lake front for the region.**Project Description**

The Lake Effect Project is a transformative plan for Wayzata's lakefront that reconnects residents to Wayzata's greatest asset, Lake Minnetonka. The project includes six elements:

- Connecting the park spaces would be a meandering Boardwalk from the Eco Park west to the Depot Park. This will provide direct public access to the lake and will include ecological restoration of the shoreline to a more natural state and helps preserve lake quality and beauty for generations to come.
- The redesign of Lake Street from Broadway Avenue to Barry Avenue to make it more pedestrian friendly with added space for sidewalk shopping and dining, landscaping and a two-way bike lane on the south side of the street that serves as an extension of the Dakota Rail Regional Trail.
- The transformation of the City's municipal parking lot at Lake Street and Broadway Avenue into a Plaza Park. This will provide flexible space for multiple uses, increase green space and provide more inviting places to enjoy beautiful lake vistas.
- Upgraded railroad crossings at Barry Avenue and at Broadway Avenue. To make the lake more accessible requires improving crossings at the railroad tracks for ease and safety.
- The Depot Park area will be upgraded to make the entire area more accessible for people with disabilities, add more green space and inviting places for enjoying lake views and new public restrooms.
- An Eco Park including a restored shoreline marsh that beautifies and improves the water quality of this area. With sufficient funds, the Historic Section Foreman House will be refurbished with a community room honoring the history of the site and an interactive learning center for programming by the Lake Minnetonka Science Collaborative and others.

This project includes approximately 1,250 linear feet of boardwalk along the lake and 15 acres of additional park space.

Overall, the remaining project cost as Fall 2019 is approximately \$20 million. This includes remaining design, construction, and contingency.

The City, along with Three Rivers Park District and the Lake Effect Conservancy have allocated approximately \$10 million dollars to pay for the reconstruction of Lake Street, a regional bike lane, updated railroad crossings, and the Plaza Park. \$10 million is needed to construct the Boardwalk, Eco

Park, and Depot Park.

In addition, the City and the Lake Effect Conservancy have already spent more than \$2 million in design and consultant costs over the past 8 years.

Project Rationale

The Lake Effect is the product of years of community conversation about reconnecting residents to Lake Minnetonka. It began taking shape through a task force that was formed by the City of Wayzata in 2011 to explore lakefront improvements that would make the lakefront:

- safe and connected,
- more environmentally sensitive, and
- open to all members of the community and region (only 2% of lakefront is accessible to public).

With the help of literally hundreds of people from the Fall of 2015 through 2016, the community shaped a vision that takes full advantage of historical assets like the Depot and the Section Foreman's House, our location right on the lake, and our opportunities to activate the lakefront.

Over many community meetings, a vision emerged that includes:

- Pedestrian improvements on Lake Street,
- A new Plaza Park that will create a four-season gathering space where there is now a lakefront parking lot,
- An Eco Park that will improve lake water quality and create educational opportunities, and
- A boardwalk that will for the first time give residents direct access to the lake.

Years of community conversations led us to focus on what has become Lake Effect and the public private partnership; the Lake Effect Conservancy.

Project Timeline

- Summer 2016---Lake Effect Scope Approved
- Spring 2018---EAW Submitted and Reviewed
- Summer 2018---Schematic Design for Entire Project Approved
- Winter 2019---Design Development for Lake Street and Plaza Park Submitted
- Summer 2019---Design Development for Eco Park, Boardwalk, and Depot Park Submitted
- Spring 2020---Construction of Lake Street and Plaza Park Start
- Spring 2021---Construction of Eco Park, Boardwalk, and Depot Park Start

Other Considerations

This is a partnership between the City of Wayzata and the Lake Effect Conservancy. The City and Three Rivers Parks are funding the redesign of Lake Street and the Plaza Park – everything north of the railroad tracks (Phase One).

The Boardwalk, the Eco Park, and the Depot Park (everything south of the railroad tracks) will need to be funded with other public dollars. The Lake Effect Conservancy will fund any additional funding gaps and assist with maintenance and operation costs. Bonding funds are being requested for the Boardwalk portion of the project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Lake Effect Conservancy, City of Wayzata, and its partners will be funding the rest of the

construction, maintenance, and operations. There will be no additional state operating dollars that are requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Wayzata

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Wayzata

Who will use or occupy the facility?

There is limited opportunities along Lake Minnetonka for the public to access the lake without either owning land on the lake or riding on a boat. Downtown Wayzata is already a regional destination. This project will allow for needed general public access to the lake and the rest of the parks.

In addition, the City and Lake Effect Conservancy has formed a collaborative of non-profits and agencies that came together around their shared interest in serving youth, the local community, engagement with Lake Minnetonka and learning. From that meeting came a vision of engaging youth in experiential, lake-focused learning on Wayzata’s lakefront. The collaborative includes the YMCA, Wayzata Community Sailing Center, Science Museum of Minnesota, Wayzata School District, University of Minnesota, MN Department of Natural Resources, Three Rivers Park District, Interfaith Outreach, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, Lake Minnetonka Association and the Wayzata Lake Effect Conservancy. Together they launched the pilot STEM Lake Exploration Camp over the past two summers as an example of the potential for great interactive STEM learning on Wayzata’s lakefront and site of the future Eco Park.

Public Purpose

To make the Wayzata’s public access along Lake Minnetonka:

- safe and connected;
- more environmentally sensitive; and
- open to all members of the community.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In 2018, the City received \$400,000 to assist in railroad crossing safety improvements in the area.

Project Contact Person

Jeffrey Dahl
City Manager
952-404-5309
jdahl@wayzata.org

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor recommends \$10 million in general obligation bonds for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Wayzata Lake Effect Boardwalk Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| Other State Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| City Funds | \$2,126 | \$7,800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other Local Government Funds | \$0 | \$1,883 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$2,326 | \$20,083 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$2,326 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$18,078 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,005 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$2,326 | \$20,083 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| 16B.325? | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|---|-----------|----|----------------------------------|-------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Station 1 | 1 | GO | 1,237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Stations and Force mains | 2 | GO | 400 | 2,312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 1,637 | 2,312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 1,637 | 2,312 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Station 1**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$1,237**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** \$1.237 million in state funds is requested to upgrade Lift Station 1. Over 1.3 million gallons of sewage per day pass through this lift station. This infrastructure is over 50 years old and has taken on additional wear and tear over time from Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) in our system.**Project Description**

Lift Station 1 pumps over 1.3 million gallons of sewage per day. The lift station was constructed in 1964. Excessive inflow/infiltration (I/I) over the past 55 years has required the pumps and station to work harder than it was intended to. Lift station 1 pumps over 1/3 of West St. Paul's total volume of sewage each day.

All pumps and associated hardware would be replaced as would the lift station controls and software.

The interior of the building which houses lift station 1 has been subjected to years of hydrogen sulfide and moisture which has led to corrosion. The electrical, HVAC and lighting are in need of upgrading as well. The existing wet well is three stories underground and access for cleaning is very difficult. With this improvement project the existing building would stay in place and be rehabilitated for continuous use. The wet well would be moved outside in front of the building for easier and safer access.

Project Rationale

The lift station is over 50 years old. Mechanical and technological improvements to the lift station will greatly reduce annual repair costs and be more energy efficient. The building which houses the equipment is deteriorating, but can be rehabilitated to last a long time if done soon. This lift station is critical infrastructure which has clearly surpassed its useful life.

Project Timeline

Design is underway and construction is scheduled for 2020

Other Considerations

West St. Paul has been reducing Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) for many years in both public lines and through programs requiring residents to fix their own I/I. Increased water to the sanitary system has added unnecessary volume to our lift stations which in turn decreases the life of our equipment. As we continuously allocate funds to reduce I/I its equally as important to upgrade our in-place sanitary infrastructure.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of West St. Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of West St. Paul

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of West St. Paul

Public Purpose

To have a reliable and improved lift station which is responsible for over 1/3 of the city's daily sewage.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous requests have been made on this project and it will be completed in one phase.

Project Contact Person

Ross Beckwith
Public Works and Parks Director/City Engineer
651-552-4130
rbeckwith@wspmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Station 1

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$1,237 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$1,237 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,474 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$2,474 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$2,474 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |

| STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | |
|---|-----|
| The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill. | |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Stations and Forcemains**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$400**Priority Ranking:** 2**Project Summary:** \$2,712,000 in state funds is requested to upgrade three sanitary sewer lift stations and replace four sanitary forcemains. Over 330,000 gallons of sewage per day pass through these lift stations and forcemains. This infrastructure is 50-60 years old and has taken on additional wear and tear over time from Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) in our system.**Project Description**

Lift Station 2 and the 1,200 foot, 6-inch forcemain were constructed in 1966. This lift station does not have a portable generator on-site which turns power outages into emergency situations. The new lift station would have a backup generator on-site. A new 6-inch PVC forcemain would be installed parallel to the existing, likely by way of directional drilling.

Lift Station 3 and the 1,278 feet of 6-inch forcemain were constructed in 1966. This lift station does not have a portable generator on site. The new lift station would have a backup generator on-site. A new 6-inch PVC forcemain would be installed parallel to the existing, likely by way of directional drilling.

Lift Station 4 and the 4,745 feet of 10-inch forcemain were constructed in 1964. The forcemain has had 3 breaks in its lifetime which were repaired. There is no portable generator on-site and in the case of a power outage, this sewer will back up into homes within 45 minutes. The new lift station would have a backup generator on-site. A new 10-inch PVC forcemain would be installed parallel to the existing, likely by way of directional drilling.

Lift Station 6 was replaced in 2016, but the 2,940 feet of 6-inch forcemain was not. This project would replace the forcemain with a PVC pipe, parallel to the existing and likely by way of directional drilling. The existing forcemain was installed in 1956.

All of the hardware and software upgrades to these lift stations would reduce on-going maintenance costs and be more energy efficient.

Project Rationale

These three lift stations and four forcemains are 50+ years old. The hardware and software equipment is outdated and requires continuous maintenance and repair. This infrastructure has exceeded its useful life and has become a risk to the city.

Project Timeline

Design would begin in 2020 with construction in 2022.

Other Considerations

West St. Paul has been reducing Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) for many years in both public lines and through programs requiring residents to fix their own I/I. Increased water to the sanitary system has added unnecessary volume to our lift stations, which in turn decreases the life of our equipment. As we

continuously allocate funds to reduce I/I it's equally important to upgrade our in-place sanitary infrastructure.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of West St. Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of West St. Paul

Who will use or occupy the facility?

City of West St. Paul

Public Purpose

Sanitary sewer lift stations and forcemains keep sewage moving through the system. Having a reliable system in place is critical property owners of West St. Paul as system failures and sewer backups would be detrimental.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous requests have been made for this project and it will be completed in one phase.

Project Contact Person

Ross Beckwith
Public Works & Parks Director/City Engineer
651-552-4130
rbeckwith@wspmn.gov

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Inflow - Infiltration and Sewer Lift Stations and Forcemains

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$400 | \$2,312 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| City Funds | \$0 | \$400 | \$2,312 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$800 | \$4,624 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$800 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,624 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$800 | \$4,624 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | Yes |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy System: Engine Generators | 1 | GO | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 6,750 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy System: Engine Generators**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$6,750**Priority Ranking:** 1

Project Summary: WLSSD requests state funding assistance for the design, purchase and installation of engine generators to convert the methane-rich biogas produced during wastewater treatment into electricity and heat for use within WLSSD's regional wastewater treatment facility. WLSSD seeks \$6.75 million in assistance, representing 50% of the \$13.5 million total project cost.

Project Description

Western Lake Superior Sanitary District (WLSSD) has embarked on a multi-year effort to design and install a combined heat and power (CHP) system in its regional wastewater treatment plant. This undertaking includes several projects that move WLSSD toward its ultimate goal of energy self-sufficiency.

Along with clean water, wastewater treatment facilities can produce clean energy. Biogas, a methane-rich byproduct of the treatment process, can be used along with other wastes to create electricity and heat. The WLSSD CHP System strategy combines efficiency enhancements in energy recovery, heating, resource recovery and wastewater solids digestion to reduce overall electrical and heating needs while allowing WLSSD to self-generate a significant portion of the electricity needed to power its energy intensive wastewater treatment plant using the biogas WLSSD currently produces.

2020 Capital Assistance Request: Engine Generators

- WLSSD plans to install generators that will use the biogas currently being produced during wastewater treatment to generate up to a significant portion of the electricity needed to power the energy-intensive wastewater treatment plant. Some biogas is currently used for heating, but unused gas is wasted. WLSSD proposes to add engine generators to convert all the biogas into electricity. WLSSD will also recover the substantial heat produced by the generators and reuse the heat in the facility.
- Total generator project cost: \$13.5 million.
Funding Sources:
\$6.75 million Minnesota Capital Assistance bonding funds;
\$6.75 million State Revolving Loan Fund loan (federal loan funding source administered by Public Facilities Authority; repaid with local funds).

Installation of generators will build on \$15.1 million in CHP system projects already completed including

- The replacement of an old, inefficient steam heating system with new, efficient hot water heating system comprised of modular boilers allowing maximum flexibility to meet varying heat demands.
- A new gas conditioning system to clean biogas for use in boilers and future use in engine generators.

- Updated electrical distribution system to support future engine generator usage and improve electrical reliability of the treatment plant.

Project Rationale

Installing generators is critical to WLSSD's ability to control costs, stabilize rates and to help ensure the resiliency and reliability of one of Minnesota's largest wastewater treatment plants.

Purchased electricity has become the largest non-payroll cost in WLSSD's wastewater operations, driving tough budgetary decisions and increased rates to users. At about \$3 million annually, electricity accounts for a third of wastewater treatment plant operating costs. WLSSD has experienced more than 72% increases in electricity rates since 2007. With annual electrical rate increases continuing, wastewater rates will continue to rise for businesses, residents and forest-products industries that are major employers in northeastern Minnesota.

WLSSD successfully uses a portion of the biogas produced to heat buildings seasonally—meeting about 8% of our energy needs. The engine generators will allow WLSSD to generate electricity, recovering 100% of the biogas currently produced—a portion of which is currently flared off and wasted during seasons when heat is not needed. The generators will also position WLSSD to reclaim other high-strength wastes in the future to produce additional biogas, thus more electricity—maximizing the use of the existing digestion facility and other existing infrastructure, while potentially reducing the amount of waste sent to the landfill. The heat from the generators will be recovered, further lowering WLSSD's demand for purchased energy. The installation of generators will allow WLSSD to meet a significant portion of treatment plant electrical needs—reducing the need for purchased electricity and reducing WLSSD's vulnerability to rising utility rates and energy costs.

As the largest U.S. discharger into Lake Superior, and the wastewater treatment provider to a large region in the state, reliable operations are vital to ensure public and environmental health in the region and to support the region's employers and manufacturers. Reduced reliance on utility power allows for WLSSD to continue operations during utility power interruptions, and natural and man-made disasters.

Project Timeline

Predesign completed in 2013

Design completed March 2019

Construction June 2020 through December 2021

Other Considerations

It is WLSSD's vision to become energy self-reliant and generate 100% of the electricity needed to operate its large, regional wastewater treatment plant.

Similar to WLSSD's planned approach, clean water agencies have successfully tackled energy efficiency and energy recovery by focusing on effective biogas utilization and adding other wastes to increase biogas production.

WLSSD is well-positioned to act on its clean energy plans. WLSSD has a robust energy efficiency program. In fact, as a member of the U.S. Department of Energy's Better Plants program since 2015, WLSSD has committed to reducing its energy use by 25% in the next few years; WLSSD is more than halfway toward this goal today. Energy recovery is an incredible opportunity for WLSSD. WLSSD's Combined Heat and Power system is planned in a stepwise manner with projects that maximize the use of existing infrastructure and existing resources.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

n/a

Who will own the facility?

Western Lake Superior Sanitary District

Who will operate the facility?

Western Lake Superior Sanitary District

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Western Lake Superior Sanitary District

Public Purpose

WLSSD's Combined Heat and Power Energy System will position WLSSD to generate up to 100% of the electricity needed to power its regional wastewater treatment facility in northeastern Minnesota—enabling WLSSD to stabilize wastewater rates for employers and residents in 17 communities (including Duluth, Proctor, Hermantown, Rice Lake, Cloquet and surrounding cities and towns) and four large industrial customers (including SAPPI and Verso pulp and paper mills). Additionally, WLSSD will also recover heat from the process for use in wastewater treatment processes and buildings. This project will help keep wastewater treatment effective and affordable for area residents and employers while improving treatment plant resiliency and contributing toward Minnesota's renewable energy goals with clean, cost-effective energy.

Description of Previous Appropriations

n/a

Project Contact Person

Marianne Bohren
Executive Director
218-740-4805
marianne.bohren@wlssd.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy System: Engine Generators

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$6,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Federal Funds | \$0 | \$6,750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$13,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$2,025 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$11,475 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment* | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$13,500 | \$0 | \$0 |

*Inflation is already included in project costs.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | N/A |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Red Leaf Court Storm Sewer | 1 | GO | 365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Red Leaf Court Storm Sewer**AT A GLANCE**

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 2020 Request Amount: | \$365 |
| Priority Ranking: | 1 |
| Project Summary: | Installation of Storm Sewer - Red Leaf Court and 18th Avenue Neighborhoods |

Project Description

Installation of a 54 inch pipe and improvements to existing ditches and culverts to direct storm water out of the residential area, under County Road towards the West Fork of the Des Moines River.

Project Rationale

In the 1970's and 1980's the residential neighborhoods in Red Leaf Court and 18th Avenue were developed. At that time storm water infrastructure consisting of ditches and culverts were constructed to handle storm water. Flooding in the area has been an issue for many years; however, recent weather events related to significantly higher rainfall (climate change) has created occasional severe flooding that damages public infrastructure (Streets, ditches and culverts) along with damage to residential homes.

An engineering study was completed to determine the drainage area. This study concluded that about 637 acres drains through this residential area. A vast majority (approximately 75%) of this drainage area is outside of City limits and consists of agricultural property.

The agricultural property, located outside of City limits, is not able to be assessed for storm water improvements by the City of Windom. As such, State funds are being requested to help off-set the impact of costs to the City of Windom and the residential property owners.

Project Timeline

- 2018 Drainage area study completed
- January - April 2019 Preliminary engineering completed
- April 2019 Public input meeting held with residents
- April - May 2019 Comment cards regarding options solicited from residents
- May - August 2019 Elevation surveys of properties completed
- May 2019 City Council directs staff to prepare a State Bonding request for project
- June 2019 City Council Resolution regarding 2020 Bonding Submission
- July - November 2019 Engineering work on selected option completed
- November - December 2019 - Feasibility Study completed and Public Hearing Held
- January - June 2020 Legislative Session - Bonding Request
- February - March 2020 Project bid as an alternate in Windom's 2020 Street Project

- June 2020 State Bonding Funds committed
- July 2020 Anticipated Bid award
- July - November 2020 Project construction and completion
- December 2020 Public Hearing on Final Assessments held

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None. Project is a one-time local government construction project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Windom

Who will operate the facility?

City of Windom will be responsible for operation and maintenance.

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Storm water infrastructure will drain approximately 637 acres of property inside and outside of the City of Windom.

Public Purpose

Mitigate damage to public infrastructure (Streets, ditches and culverts) as well as damage to privately owned residential units.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous requests or funding awards have been made for the Red Leaf Court Storm Water Project.

At this time the City of Windom has a current project for our Wastewater Treatment Plant that was partially funded with 2018 State Bonding funds. The \$3 million for this project has been expended and the project is underway. The City of Windom also received State Bonding funds (through the DNR) for a dam removal and installation of rock riffles. This \$300,000 project award was completed in 2010/2011.

Project Contact Person

Steve Nasby
City Administrator
507-831-6129
Steve.Nasby@windommn.com

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request. Rather than earmarks for individual projects, the Governor recommends \$200 million in general obligation bonds for water infrastructure projects for grant and loan programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority to be awarded to projects on the Project Priority Lists developed by the Pollution Control Agency and the Department of Health.

(\$ in thousands)

Red Leaf Court Storm Sewer

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$365 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| Non-Governmental Funds | \$0 | \$366 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$731 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$72 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$616 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$43 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$731 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | N/A |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | N/A |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | Yes |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | N/A |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | N/A |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |

(\$ in thousands)

| Project Title | Rank Fund | | Project Requests for State Funds | | | Gov's Rec | Gov's Planning Estimates | |
|--|-----------|----|----------------------------------|------|------|-----------|--------------------------|------|
| | | | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 | 2020 | 2022 | 2024 |
| Winona County Jail | 1 | GO | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Project Requests | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total | | | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

(\$ in thousands)

Winona County Jail**AT A GLANCE****2020 Request Amount:** \$5,000**Priority Ranking:** 1**Project Summary:** The MN Department of Corrections (DOC) has notified Winona County that as of September 30, 2012, the County will no longer be able to house inmates in the current jail facility. By MN statute the County Sheriff is responsible for providing a jail.**Project Description**

Winona County seeks to build a jail to replace the existing 40-year-old and outdated facility.

Project Rationale

The Winona County jail was opened in 1978 just prior to changes in rules and regulations by the MN DOC. It has operated successfully for over 40 years, however, it has been determined to be noncompliant with today's standards. The facility does not meet ADA requirements and is potentially dangerous for inmates as well as employees. Narrow doorways prohibit carrying stretches through without standing them up, programming space is almost non-existent, booking areas lack privacy, supervision is hampered by inadequate sightlines, and the infrastructure presents other safety concerns.

Project Timeline

The Winona County Board established a Jail Construction Planning Committee to interview and hire an architect and construction manager. The current working plan is to provide two initial designs, one for a 78 classified bed facility expandable to 98 beds and another with 98 classified beds.

The design will occur in 2020, construction in 2021 and 2022 with an opening in mid-2023.

Other Considerations

The County currently can not hold juveniles in the jail facility. The DOC requires sight and sound separation between adults and juveniles. The new facility will only allow 24 hour holds for juveniles unless it is constructed to meet DOC standards for hold juveniles longer. The result is that Winona County sends juveniles to remote locations sometimes out of state and as far ways as Duluth. The County is exploring incorporating a small number of beds for juvenile holds into the jail project. This presents staffing, logistical challenges, and increases costs but the benefits are significant. By holding juveniles locally they stay in contact with their support systems and family. It is difficult for parents and County staff to work with juveniles when they are housed outside the County. It is also very expensive. Juvenile outcomes would be better if they are held locally.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Winona County

Who will operate the facility?

Winona County

Who will use or occupy the facility?

Winona County Sheriff, City Police within the County, public defenders, inmates, social workers, and health providers.

Public Purpose

Winona County has an obligation per state statute to provide for the incarceration of individuals who the courts have deemed a danger to public safety or to themselves.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Ken Fritz
County Administrator
507-457-6355
kfritz@co.winona.mn.us

Governor's Recommendation

The Governor does not recommend capital funding for this request.

(\$ in thousands)

Winona County Jail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

| Funding Source | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| State Funds Requested | | | | |
| General Obligation Bonds | \$0 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Funds Already Committed | | | | |
| County Funds | \$0 | \$24,717 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Pending Contributions | | | | |
| | | | | |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$29,717 | \$0 | \$0 |

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

| Cost Category | Prior Years | FY 2020 | FY 2022 | FY 2024 |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Property Acquisition | \$0 | \$750 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Predesign Fees | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Design Fees | \$0 | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Project Management | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$21,500 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Relocation Expenses | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| One Percent for Art | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Occupancy Costs | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Inflationary Adjustment | \$0 | \$2,967 | \$0 | \$0 |
| TOTAL | \$0 | \$29,717 | \$0 | \$0 |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Is this project exempt from legislative review under M.S. 16B.335 subd. 1a? | Yes |
| Predesign Review (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 3): | |
| Does this request include funding for predesign? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration? | N/A |
| Will the project design meet the Sustainable Building Guidelines under M.S. 16B.325? | Yes |
| Will the project designs meet applicable requirements and guidelines for energy conservation and alternative energy sources (M.S. 16B.335 subd. 4 and 16B.32)? | Yes |

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Will the project comply with the targeted group purchasing requirement (M.S. 16C.16 subd. 13)? | No |
| Will the project meet public ownership requirements (M.S. 16A.695)? | Yes |
| Will a use agreement be required (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 2)? | No |
| Will program funding be reviewed and ensured (M.S. 16A.695 subd. 5)? | Yes |
| Will the matching funds requirements be met (M.S. 16A.86 subd. 4)? | Yes |
| Will the project be fully encumbered prior to the Cancellation Deadline (M.S. 16A.642): December 31, 2024? | Yes |
| M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required | Yes |
| M.S. 473.4485: Guideway Project | |
| Is this a Guideway Project? | No |
| Is the required information included in this request? | N/A |
| Has the governing body of the political subdivision passed a resolution of support, which indicates this project's priority number if the applicant is submitting multiple requests? | Yes |