

Metropolitan Council

1991 Annual Report to the Legislature

Jan. 15, 1992

Metropolitan Council
Mears Park Centre
230 E. Fifth St., St. Paul 55101
612 291-6359
TDD 291-0904

Publication No. 310-92-001

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ABOUT THIS REPORT | 1 |
| MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR | 2 |
| THE COUNCIL AT A GLANCE | 3 |
| LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES FOR 1992 | 4 |
| FISCAL DISPARITIES | 4 |
| AGRICULTURAL PRESERVES | 5 |
| METRO HRA JURISDICTION | 5 |
| REGIONAL PARKS FUNDING | 6 |
| POLICY PLANS | 7 |
| SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GUIDE CHAPTER | 7 |
| RECREATION OPEN SPACE GUIDE CHAPTER | 8 |
| METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK | 8 |
| MAJOR REPORTS AND THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS | |
| PRIORITY PROGRAMS | 10 |
| Airport Planning | 10 |
| Housing | 12 |
| Human Investment Framework | 14 |
| Solid Waste | 15 |
| Transportation | 18 |
| Water Resources Management | 20 |
| Additional Priorities for 1992 | 21 |
| OTHER ACTIVITIES | 23 |
| FINANCIAL TABLES | |
| Metropolitan Agencies 1991 and 1992 Agency Expenses | 24 |
| Metropolitan Council 1991 Budget | |
| Revenues and Expenditures, by Department | 25 |
| Metropolitan Council 1991 Actual | |
| Revenues, Expenditures and Encumbrances by Department | 26 |
| Metropolitan Council 1992 Budget | |
| Revenues and Expenditures, by Department | 27 |

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The Metropolitan Council is required by state law to submit to the Minnesota Legislature by Jan. 15 each year an annual report of its activities the previous year. To fulfill the requirements of Minnesota Statute 473.245, this report sets out the Council's recommendations for Metropolitan Area legislation. It explains regional policy plans adopted during the year, summarizes major Council studies and their recommendations, and provides Council budget information for 1991 and 1992. A list of local government plan amendments and applications for federal money submitted to the Council during 1991 is also required and is included in an appendix to this report.

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Members of the Legislature,

Nearly one year has passed since I was named chair of the Metropolitan Council. At the time of my appointment, Gov. Carlson issued a challenge to the Council to be bold, innovative and visionary in its planning. I think we are meeting the challenge.

The Council's decision to take the lead in developing a comprehensive transit strategy for the region is a good example. In the ongoing debate about light rail transit--when, where and how it should be built--a broader perspective was absent. This region must have a well-thought-out strategy that is based on all our transit needs. It must understand how a variety of transit modes--such as light rail transit, high-occupancy-vehicle lanes, and park-and-ride car pooling--might work together to meet those needs. Looking at the bigger picture will enable this region to be realistic about its transit needs and its resources, and to set priorities for using those resources wisely.

Our regional radio communications task force is another example. Many local governments in the seven-county area have outmoded emergency two-way radio systems and are running out of channel capacity. The task force is looking at the feasibility of implementing a region-wide radio network that all communities could use, rather than have each community spend more to go its own way. The task force is comprised of local government officials and emergency-service providers from throughout the region.

The Council promotes this kind of inter-community cooperation. In fact, we've made exploring the potential for governmental service-sharing a priority of our 1992 work. While partnerships among governments aren't new, the Council believes the region could benefit from more of them. Reducing costs shouldn't be the only consideration, but it is often the biggest benefit of working together. Effectiveness is another, especially when collaboration between different governmental jurisdictions--like school districts and cities--affords a better chance to address complex issues that don't fall into neat categories.

The Council has exercised regional leadership in three other critical areas this year--meeting the region's long-term needs for airport capacity, protecting the region's water resources, and better managing the region's solid waste. These efforts are described on the following pages.

In 1992 the Council will continue to provide regional leadership and focus on areas where we can have the biggest impact. We will apply our unique regional perspective. We will provide solid data, analysis and research support to local governments. We will serve as a forum to share ideas and information, and facilitate cooperation between different jurisdictions. And we will help to develop solutions that are sound and workable.

We look forward to working with you in the 1992 session.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Anderson, Chair

THE COUNCIL AT A GLANCE

The Metropolitan Council was created by the Minnesota Legislature in 1967 in large part to solve problems caused by a fragmented and overburdened sewage treatment system in the seven-county Metropolitan Area. As benefits of region-wide planning, coordination and efficiency were demonstrated, the Council was given additional planning authority under state and federal laws.

The Council developed a comprehensive plan, updated periodically, to guide land use and growth in the seven-county area. It also has authority to plan for the region's four big "systems"--transit and highways, sewers, airports and parks--as well as solid-waste management, affordable housing, services to elderly people, and water supply and quality.

In addition, the Council researches growth and development trends. It helps communities and counties resolve differences; administers a number of regional, state and federal grant and loan programs; and serves as a housing and redevelopment authority for the seven-county area.

The Council has 17 members, 16 appointed by the governor to four-year, part-time terms from districts of roughly equal population within the region. The 17th member is a full-time chair, appointed by the governor to represent the region at large. The Council's work is supported by a full-time professional staff of about 195 people. Hundreds of residents from throughout the region are involved in various ways, including serving on the Council's many citizen advisory committees.

Council members as of December 1991 are:

Mary E. Anderson, Chair

Liz Anderson, District 1
Dede Wolfson, District 2
James W. Senden, District 3
Carol A. Kummer, District 4
David F. Fisher, District 5
Donald B. Riley, District 6
Esther Newcome, District 7
Susan Anderson, District 8

Ken Kunzman, District 9
Jim Krautkremer, District 10
Polly P. Bowles, District 11
Sondra R. Simonson, District 12
Dirk deVries, District 13
Bonnie D. Featherstone, District 14
Margaret Schreiner, District 15
E. Craig Morris, District 16

LEGISLATIVE INITIATIVES

Fiscal Disparities

The fiscal disparities law, passed by the legislature in 1971, requires taxing jurisdictions in the seven-county Metro Area to contribute 40 percent of their growth in commercial-industrial property tax base since 1971 to an area-wide pool. The pool of contributions is then redistributed among all the region's communities. The redistribution of tax base is based on a community's population and how its per-capita market value of property compares with the average for the Metro Area.

The fiscal disparities law significantly reduces differences in tax base. According to the Citizens League, the ratio between the highest commercial-industrial tax base per capita and the lowest is 4 to 1 among cities with more than 9,000 residents. That ratio would be 22 to 1 without fiscal disparities.

The Metropolitan Council supports the current fiscal disparities program as an appropriate regional tool for tax-base sharing. Region-wide sharing of tax-base growth fits the Council's view that the Metropolitan Area functions as a single economic unit. The fiscal disparities program also supports regional planning objectives. Redistributing tax base spreads the benefits of economic development spurred by regional facilities such as freeways, interchanges and airports. The program also helps older communities finance redevelopment, and encourages land uses that don't produce tax revenue, such as parks.

The Council takes the following positions on fiscal disparities:

1. Since the program is working to reduce tax-base disparities, as originally intended, no further changes should be undertaken.
2. If the law is going to be opened up and debated at the legislature, then the Council's positions on the issues are as follows:
 - The legislature should explore ways to adjust contributions for assessment practices, thereby improving the fairness of the program.
 - Exemptions for pre-1979 tax-increment financing districts should be phased out over time and the same rules should apply to those districts that apply to the post-1979 districts.
 - Because Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport property tax status is complex and its tax value is relatively small, no change is recommended.
 - The pre-1971 base exemption should not be phased out.
 - The contribution rate should remain the same.
 - The fiscal disparities base should not be adjusted for inflation.
 - The formula for distributing the fiscal disparities metro-wide pool should not be changed to take needs into account.

Agricultural Preserves

The Metropolitan Agricultural Preserves Program was established in 1980 to help preserve long-term agricultural areas within the seven-county Metropolitan Area. The program is an important piece of the Metropolitan Council's growth strategy for the region: to encourage urban development in the metropolitan urban service area and discourage development in the rural area.

The program was designed to place Metro Area farmland on a more equal footing with farmland in outstate Minnesota, which is not affected by urban pressures for development. Farmland enrolled in the program is assessed according to its agricultural use rather than its market value. The maximum property tax rate for ag preserve land is 105 percent of the previous year's statewide average tax rate levied by townships. If the local rate is higher, the difference is paid in the form of a tax credit by the county or state conservation fund. Thus, the tax credits paid under the program are a function of relative property tax rates inside and outside the Metro Area.

In recent years, however, statewide farmland values have declined and tax rates have increased. In the Metro Area, farmland values have increased and tax rates have remained fairly stable. This has resulted in a dramatic decrease in the amount of tax credits paid to Metro Area farmers.

The Council recommends the following changes in the law:

1. Establish a minimum tax credit of \$3 per acre for all land enrolled in the program.

A minimum credit would guarantee some level of benefit for all program participants each year. Even with the program, farmland in the Metro Area is valued higher than farmland in greater Minnesota. Tax rates in the Metro Area are no longer much higher than in the rest of the state, partly because of the tax-base differences. This means that farmers in the Metro Area pay significantly higher taxes, and many participants have received no tax credits during the last several years.

2. Lower the minimum parcel size eligible to participate in the program from 40 acres to 20 acres, with exceptions to permit parcels as small as 10 acres to be enrolled. Remove the restrictions on soil type for parcels less than 40 acres.

This change would permit smaller parcels that still meet the definition of "agriculture" for property-tax purposes to enroll in the program. It would permit land used for livestock and poultry operations, truck farms, nursery products and other farms not on the highest-quality soils to receive protection. This is consistent with local government and Council land-use objectives.

Metropolitan Housing and Redevelopment Authority Jurisdiction

Federal law governing the Section 8 rent assistance program was amended in November 1990 to require public housing agencies to administer the Section 8 program on a statewide basis. Under the new provisions, Section 8 families residing in the seven-county Metro Area who want to move to any location in Minnesota outside the Metro Area (or into St. Croix County, Wisconsin) can

do so, and Metro HRA must provide Section 8 assistance to those families.

Current state law does not recognize the change in federal law. The Metro HRA's legal jurisdiction under state law is limited to the seven-county area. Under the new federal provisions, the Metro HRA can and does operate outside its state-defined legal jurisdiction.

In addition, state law prohibits the Council from administering the Section 8 program in local communities within the Metro Area that operate their own Section 8 program. One community recently opted out of the voucher portion of the program, effectively leaving administration of vouchers in that community, under federal law, to the Council.

To minimize the risk and associated costs of litigation that may arise out of the Metro HRA's administration of the Section 8 program, the Council recommends that state law be amended to clarify the Metro HRA's authority to administer the Section 8 program pursuant to statewide portability provisions in federal law.

Regional Parks Funding

The legislature has since 1976 provided funding for acquisition and development of the seven-county area regional park system. The legislature has also, since 1985, provided funds for supplemental grants to help operate and maintain the parks.

In order to continue to finance the cost of regional park acquisition and development, and to operate and maintain the regional park system, the Council is asking the legislature to appropriate for the 1993-94 biennium:

- \$24.99 million for capital funding, plus a special \$5 million appropriation for Lake Minnetonka; and
- \$3 million in state general funds for operation and maintenance of the parks.

The Council will also support efforts at the legislature to secure funds for debt service payments for bonds sold by the regional park implementing agencies for regional park acquisition and development. The agencies are Washington County, Suburban Hennepin Regional Park District, St. Paul and Minneapolis.

The Council will work the Metropolitan Parks and Open Space Commission to review and evaluate alternative funding sources for regional parks.

POLICY PLANS

MANAGING SOLID WASTE

The seven-county Metropolitan Area already has made substantial progress in improving how it deals with solid waste. But more needs to be done to protect the environment and recapture resources. The Council in 1991 adopted a new policy plan for improving solid waste management to the year 2010. The plan:

- Puts greater responsibility on waste generators to recycle and reduce the amount of waste they produce in the first place. The plan calls for expanding recycling-collection service and establishing trash-collection fees based on the weight or volume of waste produced.
- Strengthens economic incentives to process waste rather than dispose of it in landfills. The plan proposes increased landfill fees to reflect all the costs of using landfills, including costs of managing them after they are closed.
- Calls for metropolitan counties (which are primarily responsible for carrying out the regional solid waste plan) to cooperatively develop and operate waste facilities as one regional system so that all solid waste is handled in the most appropriate and cost-effective way.
- Calls for counties to plan for managing all solid waste produced in the region (except industrial hazardous wastes), including wastes like hazardous household chemicals and debris from building demolitions.
- Says that toxic materials should be removed from the waste stream and be managed separately from waste that is incinerated or processed in other ways. The plan calls for the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to develop a list of materials on which to assess a statewide fee or tax because of their toxicity as waste. Revenues would help pay for public education efforts and household hazardous-waste collection programs.
- Sets a high recycling goal of 50 percent by the year 2000, thereby providing more balance between recycling and waste processing.
- Strives to reduce the region's dependence on landfills to a minimum. However, it says some landfill capacity will be needed to handle the percentage of waste that can't be processed or recycled in the future, as well as the rejects, residuals and ash from recycling and resource-recovery facilities.
- Shows a preference among waste management methods. Ranked first is waste reduction (keeping materials from getting into the waste stream in the first place); second, materials recovery (recycling); third, composting yard wastes and food wastes; fourth, resource recovery (including refuse-derived-fuel processing, mass burning or mixed-waste composting); and last, land disposal.

RECREATION OPEN SPACE

The seven-county Metro Area's regional park system was first created in 1974. It has grown to include 29 parks, 10 park reserves, four trail corridors and a floral display garden--in all, 45,000 acres of land. In 1991, the Council revised its regional plan for parks. The plan:

- Reaffirms strong support for a regional system based on high-quality natural resources, rather than one that focuses on uniform geographic distribution or population location.
- Assigns top funding priority to acquisition of land in danger of being lost to potential park use, and to development and redevelopment of parkland where user demand is greatest.
- Establishes a strong new focus for planning, acquiring and developing a cohesive regional trail network. Seven new trails and a substantial extension of an existing trail are proposed.
- Reaffirms the responsibility of the state to fund major acquisition and development projects for regional parks that include unique natural resources and/or are widely used by visitors from Greater Minnesota.
- Identifies the urgent need to find a new major, reliable, long-term source of funding to acquire and develop regional parkland. The funding would supplement existing state aids and Metro Area bonds.
- Identifies the pivotal role assigned to master plans prepared by the park implementing agencies in the process of planning, programming and funding regional recreation open space.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK: RURAL AREA POLICIES

The *Metropolitan Development and Investment Framework (MDIF)* outlines the Council's basic strategy for managing the region's resources, including highways and transit, sewers, parks and airports, as well as the public dollars spent on them. The framework calls for encouraging growth within an area where needed urban services are provided, and not providing services outside it. In this way, the framework divides the region into urban and rural service areas.

In 1991, the Council adopted amendments to its *MDIF* policies for the general rural use area. This is the area outside the metropolitan urban service area that is not designated for commercial agriculture. Over 40 percent of Metro Area land falls into this category. The amendments are designed to reaffirm the basic strategy of restricting extensive development outside the urban area and, at the same time, give rural area communities more flexibility. The amended plan:

- Allows residential development at densities of no more than one unit per 10 acres

computed on a 640-acre basis (a maximum of 64 units per square mile).

- Reaffirms Council policy of no minimum lot size to allow clustering of homes within the 640-acre parcel. Lot sizes should be determined by performance standards. At a minimum, they must ensure at least two sewage disposal drainfields on each site: a primary drainfield and a replacement should the original system fail.
- Supports--in addition to agriculture, single-family homes, existing development and urban-generated uses--other land uses in the general rural use area. These uses must be consistent with local and regional plans, and cannot require urban-level support services (such as highways, sewers or transit).
- Encourages local governments to plan for rural-to-urban transition areas in their comprehensive plans, and will support local efforts to prevent development incompatible with future urbanization.
- May require communities to modify comprehensive plans that are inconsistent with the policies. The Council will consider exceptions to the policies for local governments that cannot meet the policies because of existing subdivisions or land developments. Criteria for exceptions are spelled out in an appendix to the *MDIF*.

MAJOR REPORTS AND THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS

PRIORITY PROGRAMS

Each year, the Council identifies several priority issues and focuses a large portion of its resources on them. The Council's 1991 priorities were long-term airport system planning, housing, integrated planning for human services, solid waste management, transportation and water resources management.

Airport Planning

The Council's primary focus in airport planning during 1991 was the "dual-track" planning process mandated by the 1989 legislature. One track focuses on siting a possible replacement major airport for the region; the Council and the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) are conducting this planning. The second track involves finding ways to improve the capacity of the current major airport, Minneapolis-St. Paul International (MSP); the MAC is responsible for this effort.

Council Recommends Dakota Search Area - In December 1991 the Council designated a 115-square-mile area in east-central Dakota County as the search area within which a site will be located for a possible replacement airport for MSP. The Dakota Search Area was recommended in September by the Council's 41-member New Airport Search Area Advisory Task Force. Their recommendation was the culmination of a two-year study of potential search areas in the 14-county greater metro region.

The Dakota Search Area was found to be the most suitable. It provides the best overall access in time and distance to the entire Metro Area. It has the fewest environmental constraints in terms of wetlands, floodplains, peat soils, and sensitive plant and animal habitats. The area also has the most favorable characteristics in terms of housing and population density, land uses and noise impacts. Other criteria evaluated included general land requirements, airspace considerations, and policy considerations.

The Council also made several associated recommendations in its report to the legislature. They include:

1. *Dual-Track Major Airport Planning Strategy*. The Council and the MAC should:

- Examine in the *1991 Annual Contingency Assessment Report* ways to shorten and expedite the planning process required for the new major airport site selection, airport development planning and environmental analysis;
- Develop a detailed planning time line for the siting process (1992-1996 or a shortened period) for use by the affected units of government, public agencies and

general public; and

- Develop a budget for future work on both tracks of the process.

2. *New-Major Airport Siting.* The MAC should establish an interactive planning process with the affected communities, Dakota County and regional and state agencies to assist in the new-airport studies. The MAC and the Council should address the issues identified in the "Issues to be Addressed During New-Major Airport Site Selection Process" section of the report titled *Selecting a Search Area for a New Major Airport, Part Four: Search Area Designation*, in the planning for a potential new-major airport in the Dakota Search Area.

3. *Land-Use Compatibility.* The Council should work closely with Dakota County and communities in and around the search area to develop a joint management plan for land-use compatibility around a new airport that would take effect if the decision is made to build a new major airport.

4. *Financial and Technical Assistance.* Communities in the search area should be provided financial and/or technical assistance for their participation in the site selection and new airport planning process. The Council should work with the communities, Dakota County and the MAC to develop technical and financial assistance proposals for legislative consideration for the 1992 legislative session. The report and recommendations should be presented to the Minnesota Advisory Council on Metropolitan Airport Planning.

5. *Assistance for Home Owners and Land Owners.* The Metropolitan Council, in consultation with the search area communities, Dakota County and the MAC, should prepare a proposal for a purchase guarantee program and funding source to assist owners of individual homes and/or small acreage who are facing a hardship situation in selling their properties at fair prices in the search area. The report and recommendations should be presented to the Minnesota Advisory Council on Metropolitan Airport Planning.

6. *Airport Site Protection.* The Metropolitan Council, in conjunction with the search area communities, Dakota County, the MAC and communities adjacent to MSP should study the pros and cons of various site protection measures, their impacts on the local area and how they could be implemented for each track of the dual track process. The study should be presented to the Minnesota Advisory Council on Metropolitan Airport Planning.

7. *Contingency Planning Assessment.* In 1992, as a part of the contingency planning process, the Council in consultation with MAC should reassess the long-term major airport capacity needs of the region and the adequacy of MSP. This update of the 1988 MSP adequacy study should be carried out with the assistance of an independent panel of experts to evaluate the basic assumptions and methodology used to develop long-term aviation forecasts for the region. This should include a financial assessment of the state's budget in order to make a determination as to whether or not it is appropriate to continue with the dual-track process.

Dual-Track Planning on Track - In January 1991 the Council completed its second annual assessment of factors that influence the timing and choices made under the dual-track strategy. The factors include trends and forecasts of aircraft landings and takeoffs, the economy of the

region, growth in passenger and freight travel, and changes in the airline industry.

Traffic at MSP continued to grow during 1990. The number of passengers increased by 4.5 percent, to 9.6 million in 1990. The number of flights increased by 4.3 percent over the same period. Both rates exceed the one percent long-term annual rate of growth supporting the economic justification for new airport capacity for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

The regional carrier market showed the strongest growth, with passengers up by 20.2 percent and flights by 25.5 percent. This is a significant change from last year's forecast that said regional traffic would be the slowest growing segment at MSP.

Hubbing traffic at MSP increased sharply over 1989. The number of incoming passengers flying on to other destinations, a measure of hubbing activity, grew by 12.2 percent in 1990.

The report concluded that no changes in the scope and timing of the dual-track major airport strategy are needed.

Reliever Airport System Needs Improvements - The Council in 1991 concluded a lengthy study of the Metro Area's system of seven reliever airports. It found that the system cannot adequately meet future air-traffic demand levels, and that the useful life of MSP will be shortened unless the reliever system is improved. The Council made three primary recommendations to address deficiencies identified in the system:

- Develop a parallel runway and air-traffic control tower at Anoka County-Blaine Airport.
- Investigate the feasibility of building an additional reliever airport in northwestern Hennepin County.
- Encourage diversion of air traffic to airports that have surplus capacity.

The Council will work with the MAC and the Federal Aviation Administration to continue to monitor the reliever system and plan to implement the study's recommendations.

Housing

Regional Housing Plan Recommended - In 1991 the Council's 43-member Regional Housing Task Force completed its work. The task force was appointed in 1990 to identify and discuss the primary housing problems facing the region in the 1990s and to recommend policies, programs and legislation aimed at solving the problems.

The impetus for the task force came from several Council studies that pointed out major shifts that will be occurring in the region's housing market. The shifts will be caused by changing demographics, the rapid aging of the region's housing stock and the potential deterioration of central city and older suburban neighborhoods.

Task force members included legislators, local elected officials, builders, realtors, financial experts and community leaders. The group focused its discussion in four areas: rental housing, home ownership, housing and services, and neighborhood stabilization.

The task force's final recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. Despite times of fiscal austerity, the state and federal governments need to increase their commitment to housing for people with low incomes in the form of both program appropriations and tax benefits. The state should expand the existing housing trust fund, which helps provide housing for people with very low incomes.
2. The task force recommended several policy directions to guide delivery of housing and services and implementation of neighborhood plans. Among them are:
 - Promote self-sufficiency and maximizing a person's potential through housing and service programs.
 - Support and facilitate direct neighborhood and community involvement in housing planning.
 - Maximize existing funding and resources for housing and services.
 - Use rehabilitation, maintenance and adaptation of the existing housing stock as the principal methods to meet regional housing needs.
3. The task force recommended that the Council should develop a comprehensive regional housing plan, similar in scope to its region-wide plans for sewers and transportation. The plan should identify the region's overall housing needs and resources, and identify ways to bridge gaps between them. The state should mandate and fund the development of local housing plans that respond to the policies and strategies of the regional plan. Local plans should contain a housing inventory to identify current and potential market-rate rental and subsidized housing that is affordable. The inventories should also identify single- and multifamily housing, including group homes and homeless shelters. Local plans should include redevelopment plans for deteriorating neighborhoods. The plans should also identify existing and needed linkages between housing and services--such as transportation, day care and job training.

The Council accepted the report and formed a group to develop specific legislative proposals. The group was expected to report to the Council in January 1992.

What Makes a Neighborhood Vital? - Another major study undertaken by the Council's Housing Program in 1991 focused on neighborhoods--what they are, how they function and what makes them work well. The report, near completion at the end of 1991, reflects the complexity and diversity of issues that shape neighborhoods in the region. A forum was held in December to present a draft of the report to neighborhood representatives. Participants in the forum identified areas where the Council can play an important role in strengthening neighborhoods. In the second phase of the study, the Council will develop policies related to neighborhoods that can be incorporated into upcoming revisions of the *Housing Guide Chapter* and *Metropolitan Development and Investment Framework*, as well as the Council's *Human Investment Framework*.

Housing Development Fees - In 1990 the Council undertook a study of the impact of government fees, regulations and processes on the cost of housing. The study began with a survey of 25

developing cities and 25 of the largest developers and builders in the region. An advisory group of area builders, local officials and others knowledgeable on the subject assisted in development of the final report. A number of recommendations are made in the report, primary of which are the following:

- Builders/developers and cities should establish an ongoing joint committee, cosponsored by the Builders Association of Minnesota and the Association of Metropolitan Municipalities, to discuss new housing development issues of mutual concern and to prepare joint policies and model codes, regulations and procedures that can be adopted by cities and builders.
- Cities that do not have adequate supplies of lower-cost housing should adjust their new housing development fee schedules so that they can reduce the fees charged for lower-cost housing.

The Council's Metropolitan and Community Development Committee received the report in December but did not adopt its recommendations. No further action is anticipated.

In 1992 the Council will complete an inventory of the region's current housing stock. The inventory will be used to develop a regional housing plan, and to revise the goals and policies contained in the Housing Guide Chapter of the *Metropolitan Development Guide*. The Council may also pursue legislative and identified regional funding options recommended by the Regional Housing Task Force.

Human Investment Framework

One of the Council's roles has been to analyze the region's long-term investments in physical facilities to determine the most effective way to spend public dollars. But because people are the region's most important resource, the Council believes it is also essential that regional policies promote a productive, healthy and secure population within a vital regional community. To do a better job of using our collective, but limited, resources, three questions are important to answer:

- Is the Twin Cities Area investing effectively and efficiently in its people?
- How should the region's human investments be changed?
- What regional policies should guide those investments?

The first step is to gather information.

When people think of human services, they tend to think of welfare and health-related programs. But the region's investments in people are much broader than that. They include such things as education, public transportation and law enforcement. In analyzing human investment in the region, the Council is looking at 11 service categories: physical and mental health; food and clothing; income and economic opportunity; housing; transportation; education; support for individuals and families; safety and security; personal growth; environmental quality; and organized action. Following is a summary of three major Council studies in human investments near completion in late 1991.

Human Services Inventory - A comprehensive data-gathering effort to determine what human service programs and facilities exist in the region, where they are located and who provides them. The final report will describe by type of service and county, the number of public and private agencies and organizations that provide each service. A geographic map will be developed that will help analyze the implications for urban, suburban and rural parts of the region.

Human Resources Spending - A comprehensive description and analysis of public and private philanthropic spending on human services in the seven-county area. Information sources include state departments, counties, United Ways and other organized giving, the Council on Foundations, local governments and school districts. The final report will identify revenue sources for spending in the 11 categories described above, including which level of government funds services and what revenue sources it uses. The study will allow policymakers to examine appropriate levels of services as well as the mix of public, private and nonprofit agencies delivering services.

Life Cycle Study - A study of individuals' needs over the course of the life cycle, combined with the Council's demographic forecasts, to anticipate future pressures on various human service programs in the Metro Area. The study takes into consideration the changing ethnic and racial composition of the region's population and the effects of social trends and technological change. The study is scheduled to be completed in April 1992.

In 1991 the Council also completed a draft report on the growing diversity of the Twin Cities Area population and its implications for housing policy. The report explores the diversity of housing needs and preferences among the four major communities of color in the Twin Cities Area. Topics covered include rental and home ownership rates; space and spatial arrangements; housing types and conditions; location; and the impact of income on these areas. The report discusses housing issues common across all segments of the population, issues that spring directly from economic differences, and issues specifically related to cultural and ethnic differences. Policy conflicts resulting from both economic and cultural differences among various populations are identified.

In 1992 the Council will use the information from these studies to help develop a general policy document on human-service investments for the region.

Solid Waste

The Council is in charge of planning the management of the Metro Area's solid waste. In this role, it studies ways to best manage waste and develops policies for a regional management system. It also conducts environmental reviews of proposed facilities, administers an extensive grant program to encourage recycling and other alternatives to landfilling waste, and works with other agencies to develop coordinated approaches to dealing with solid waste.

Much of the solid waste division's work in 1991 focused on completing a new policy plan (see page 7). Other major reports and their recommendations are summarized below.

Region Makes Progress Toward Abating Landfills - The seven-county Metropolitan Area used 39 percent less landfill space from July 1990 through June 1991 than in the previous year, the

Council reported to the legislature in November. The *Fiscal Year 1991 Abatement Progress Report for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area* reported that the region recycled nearly one million tons of municipal solid waste, or about 37 percent of the total managed, including yard waste.

The region's five facilities that process waste to generate energy received about 1.2 million tons of garbage during the year. Of that, an estimated 469,000 tons were landfilled as excess waste, rejects unable to be processed, processing residuals and incinerator ash. In sum, about 30 percent of the region's municipal waste was converted to energy. To reduce the amount of waste from resource recovery facilities that is landfilled, the report recommends that the counties coordinate their efforts. Waste that can't be shredded into fuel at one facility should be shipped to another for incineration, or perhaps go to a composting facility.

About 440,000 tons of raw garbage was landfilled because of a lack of processing capacity, bringing the total waste landfilled to 909,000 tons. The report estimates the region has about five years of landfill space left if no expansions or new landfills are permitted. The Council supports the new landfill siting process proposed by Metro Area counties, the report says.

The Council projects that the municipal waste stream will grow an average of 1.6 percent annually in the 1990s, even with more aggressive recycling and waste reduction efforts. The figures reported by the counties this year confirmed the Council's estimate of waste stream growth. The estimates are significant because they point to the need for additional waste processing capacity.

The report makes the following recommendations:

Waste Generation

- Metropolitan counties, state agencies and the Council should develop a comprehensive strategy that quantifies on a periodic basis the region's total solid waste stream for use in future development and refinement of waste management policies and programs.

Waste Reduction

- Volume- or weight-based trash collection fees should provide sufficient fee increments to promote waste reduction. Providing unlimited service should be discouraged.
- An environmental protection fee should be added to tipping fees at all land disposal facilities in the state. Funds accumulated from the fee should pay for environmental protection costs, including the removal of toxic materials from the waste stream, and should encourage generators to participate in future waste reduction efforts.
- A tax or fee should be assessed on materials determined by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency to harm the environment. Monies accumulated should be placed in a dedicated fund to reduce the toxicity of the waste stream.

Recycling

- Cities and counties should work to expand the number of materials recycled and should work

toward same-day recycling and garbage collection.

- Cities and counties should make use of their licensing procedures to improve reporting of commercial and industrial recycling by private haulers and recyclers.
- Counties should continue to offer yard-waste composting and direct land-spreading, although subsidies should begin to be phased out. The Council and counties should continue to inform people of the yard waste ban and encourage generators to mulch, compost or separate yard wastes for collection and processing at centralized yard-waste management facilities.

Metropolitan Landfill Abatement Account: Fiscal Year 1991 Expenditures and Activities

Report - Operators of mixed municipal solid waste landfills in the region pay a \$2-per-cubic-yard surcharge on waste accepted and disposed of at the landfills. The Council receives \$1.50 of this surcharge to fund activities designed to reduce the region's need for landfills. In fiscal year 1991 the Council awarded \$2.4 million in grants to counties, cities and towns, businesses, public institutions and nonprofit agencies for projects ranging from researching plastics recycling to establishing recycling programs in schools.

Facility Reviews

Minnesota Industrial Containment Facility - The Council conducted an environmental impact review of a proposal by USPCI, Inc., to construct a nonhazardous industrial waste containment facility in Rosemount. The facility would occupy about 120 acres with an additional 116 acres as a buffer. The review found the facility is needed and that the project's design includes necessary safeguards. No significant environmental impacts are anticipated.

RECOMP Municipal Solid Waste Composting Facility - A private firm, RECOMP, Inc., proposes to build a facility to compost 400 tons per day of municipal solid waste on a 30-acre site in Rosemount. The Council in its environmental assessment worksheet found no significant environmental impacts from the project.

Scott County Municipal Solid Waste Compost Project - Scott County proposes to build a facility to compost 200 tons per day of municipal solid waste from Scott and Carver Counties on a 35-acre site in Louisville Township. The Council in its draft environmental assessment worksheet found no significant environmental impacts from the project.

Burnsville Sanitary Landfill Expansion - The Council in October made a preliminary conclusion that a certificate of need should be issued for a 63-acre expansion of the Burnsville landfill. The Council found that existing regional landfill capacity could be exhausted by the mid-1990s and that it is too risky to rely on the metropolitan landfill siting process to develop alternative landfill sites. In its draft environmental impact statement, the Council found no significant environmental impacts from the expansion.

The Council in 1991 also advocated that the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) issue a permit for a resource recovery facility in Dakota County. The facility, which would incinerate an estimated 233,000 tons of municipal solid waste annually, is needed to cut down on landfilling of waste. In fiscal year 1991 the region landfilled 440,000 tons of raw garbage, and an additional

469,000 tons from processing facilities of incinerator ash and excess waste, rejects and residuals. some of which could have been processed at another facility. In December the MPCA voted to deny a permit for the Dakota County incinerator.

In 1992, the Council will monitor the region's progress in implementing the solid waste policy plan and propose legislation to implement the plan. It will also report to the legislature on 1992 landfill abatement progress, review county solid waste master plans and prepare environmental reviews of proposed facilities. In the 1992-93 biennium, about six million dollars will be available in grants to support local recycling programs, help develop and implement new ways to reduce and recycle the region's waste, and continue regional recycling and waste reduction information programs. In a new initiative, the Council will provide technical assistance to business and industry to help them reduce and recycle waste in their operations, and design products that are less toxic and have reduced packaging.

Transportation

In 1991 the Council worked on several fronts to develop a balanced transportation system to meet the region's long-term needs. Among the Council's primary projects were the following:

Regional transit plan - The Council in December 1991 released a draft regional transit plan that, if fully carried out, would substantially change the way Twin Citians travel around the region over the next several decades. The Council initiated the plan in order to establish a unified vision of transit needs in the region, one that replaces the piecemeal approach to transit occurring in recent years. The plan draws together ideas and proposals from all the transportation planning agencies in the region--the Council, the Regional Transit Board (RTB), the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) and other organizations.

To maintain the region's mobility, the plan proposes strategies on four broad fronts:

- Reorganizing and reinvigorating transit service. Twelve new transit hubs would be developed, in addition to nine park-and-ride lots and two bus layover facilities. Transit would better serve suburb-to-suburb and city-to-suburb trips. It would be strengthened in the central cities and fully developed suburbs. Developing suburbs would get more local service.
- Improving the efficiency and safety of the existing highway system. This would enable transit vehicles to travel smoothly in mixed traffic. Examples include meters at freeway entrance ramps and systems that monitor traffic for problems and advise drivers accordingly.
- Giving advantages to "high-occupancy vehicles" (HOVs) like buses and carpools. This encourages people to share rides or ride transit. Examples include reserving highway lanes for exclusive HOV use and building bypass lanes at metered freeway entrances that enable HOVs to go around a line of waiting cars.
- Encouraging higher-density, "pedestrian-friendly" development in corridors that are easily accessible by transit and ridesharing. This would create stronger "magnets" for trip destinations, boosting transit ridership, reducing congestion and revitalizing older urban areas.

The plan also calls for construction of two light rail transit lines: the first between the Minneapolis and St. Paul downtowns, and the second in the Interstate Hwy. 35W corridor south of downtown Minneapolis.

The Council scheduled a public meeting to hear comments on the plan for January 1992. The final plan will be presented to the legislature in February 1992.

Earlier in 1991, the Council reviewed the RTB's 1991-1995 Five-Year Transit Plan. It disapproved the plan, and asked for several changes, including: reevaluate regional LRT priorities and either confirm the top priority corridor or propose a new one; undertake a comprehensive reevaluation of Metro Mobility, a specialized transit service for elderly people and people with disabilities; provide additional financial information, including fare changes and their impacts on users, ridership and system revenues; and others.

The Council also reviewed environmental reviews of the Northeast and Midway LRT corridors.

Travel Behavior Inventory (TBI) - In 1991 the Council completed data collection for the TBI, the first major travel survey in the seven-county Metro Area since 1970. Most of the Council's work in 1991 focused on analysis of the data and recalibration of computer models used to estimate and forecast travel throughout the region. Reports of specific components of the TBI are expected to be published late in 1991 and in 1992. These include reports of surveys from home interviews; business establishments; on-board transit; traffic counting; traffic coming into and leaving the region; special generator surveys at six locations (including the airport and the University); and a highway speed study. An overall report will be published in mid-1992.

Freeway upgrading - The Council worked with Mn/DOT and local communities to complete environmental impact studies on upgrading Interstate Hwys. 494 and 35W. Drafts of both studies were expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Traffic management - The Council worked with Minneapolis to form a Traffic Management Organization (TMO) to deal with growing congestion downtown. The Council also continued its support of the I-494 TMO.

1992 Transportation Unified Planning Work Program for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area - The Council in 1991 continued to coordinate all major transportation planning activities through the Transportation Advisory Board. It issued this report describing the proposed transportation and transportation-related planning activities in the Metro Area for 1992 and who is responsible for them. Participants in the activities include the Council, Mn/DOT, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, the MAC and the RTB.

In 1992 the Council will, among other activities, complete the transit facilities plan; review LRT plans; review the preferred alternative decisions for I-35W and I-494; amend the transportation policy plan sections on transit and highways; review applications for right-of-way acquisition loans and revise program guidelines; prepare the TBI summary report and conduct a planners forum on the TBI; conduct the third annual contingency planning assessment as part of the dual-track airport planning process; study the potential reuse of MSP in the event the legislature chooses to build a new major airport; and review the MAC's capital improvement program.

Water Resources Management

The Council continued working to help conserve and protect the Twin Cities Area's water supply. In 1991 the Council focused on developing a proposed long-term water supply plan for the region and planning a coordinated effort to reduce pollution in the Minnesota River.

Long-term water supply plan - In response to the drought of the late 1980s, the 1989 legislature asked the Council to prepare a short-term plan and a long-term plan to protect and conserve the Twin Cities Area's vulnerable water supply. The short-term plan was completed in 1990. In 1991, the Council formulated a proposed long-term plan, to be submitted to the legislature by Feb. 1, 1992.

In developing the proposal, the Council published a series of eight background technical studies to gather data and frame the pertinent issues. The technical studies covered the following water supply issues: alternative sources, water demand, availability, the public water supply system, conservation, effects of low flow on water quality, the economic value of water and the institutional framework for water supply management.

These issues were summarized and framed for discussion in a ninth report, *Water Supply Issues in the Metropolitan Area: A Staff Report*. In November the Council published its tenth water supply report of the year, a draft of a long-term regional plan, *Metropolitan Area Water Supply: A Plan for Action*. The proposal calls for a coordinated, region-wide effort to safeguard the seven-county Metro Area's water supply, considered vital to the region's economy.

The proposal asks the legislature to mandate a region-wide planning effort to be carried out by the region's cities, townships and counties, along with the Council. The plan would require communities to address water supply issues in comprehensive plans submitted to the Council for review.

The plan would require each community to provide:

- A description of its water supply system, including its source of water, wells, supply lines, treatment plants and major commercial and industrial users.
- A water conservation program, including emergency preparedness, conservation techniques, pricing methods to reduce demand, reduction of nonessential water uses, and a public education program.
- Suggestions for joint efforts with neighboring communities to share water sources and treatment, including sharing water supplies and pursuing alternative sources.
- A plan to protect surface water and groundwater from pollution, and proposed solutions to actual or anticipated water supply problems.

The proposal also calls for:

- The Department of Natural Resources to ensure that communities, businesses and industries are using water resources wisely. Water users also would be required to prepare water supply contingency plans--actions to be taken in the event of contamination or shortage.
- The state to establish an authority to identify and manage the potential for accidental spills in the Mississippi River, install a system to detect contamination, and implement

emergency cleanup efforts.

- The Council to continue its efforts, including developing data on water use and availability, models of groundwater and surface water and their projected use, information on conservation, and evaluation of alternative supplies and opportunities for water sharing.
- Forming an organization of groups and agencies dealing with and affected by the Mississippi River as a focal point for action.
- A one-time legislative appropriation of \$1 million for the Council to initiate the study and develop tools needed to address the region's water supply system. A decision on long-term funding to carry out the plan is yet to be made.

Reducing "nonpoint" pollution in the Minnesota River - The Council continued its work to meet a federal mandate to reduce nonpoint pollution (urban and rural storm water runoff) by 40 percent to the Minnesota River by 1996. This effort is the first priority in a broader plan to improve surface water quality throughout the Metro Area. In planning the Minnesota River cleanup effort, the Council:

- Evaluated results of monitoring water quality of seven tributaries to the Minnesota River;
- Provided background and related information to a 20-member technical work group made up of local planners, engineers and other technical staff;
- Designed a survey of local land use controls affecting the management of surface water quality. The survey will be used in 1992; and
- Organized a study of how agricultural land use practices in watersheds upstream of Shakopee affect water quality in the Minnesota River.

Other water quality work - The Council in 1991 also: reviewed the Metropolitan Waste Control Commission's 1992 implementation plan; reviewed local comprehensive and sewer plans; completed a handbook local governments can use to protect groundwater; published a lake survey report; and, together with the DNR and other state agencies, developed an approach and criteria to determine sensitivity of groundwater areas.

In 1992 the Council will: finish the long-term water supply plan and submit it to the legislature by Feb. 1; complete preliminary sewer flow projections; negotiate federal water quality permits for Blue Lake and Seneca sewage treatment plants; develop recommendations to meet the goal to reduce pollution in the Minnesota River by 40 percent in watersheds upstream of Shakopee; begin developing target recommendations to reduce pollution in watersheds emptying into the Mississippi and St. Croix Rivers; begin collecting data on the impact of urban runoff on groundwater quality; and conduct and summarize a 1992 lake survey.

Additional Priorities for 1992

The Council has designated eight priorities for its 1992 work program. Four continue from 1991: transportation, solid-waste management, water resources management, and housing. Below are summaries of the additional priorities.

Promoting Service Delivery Initiatives - The Council will examine and promote service delivery initiatives among local jurisdictions in the region to reduce the cost of providing government

services. Among the activities planned are the following:

- The Council will hold two forums in 1992 on the subject of service delivery initiatives. The first will take place in February or March. It will focus on sharing information about cooperative service delivery that is already occurring in the region and in other parts of the U.S.
- The Council will establish a regional clearinghouse of information for local governments. The Intergovernmental Resource Center will be located in the Council's library and will provide information to local governments about local cooperation, collaboration, consolidation and other innovative service delivery initiatives.
- The Council will serve as an advocate for cities and townships by helping to remove barriers which slow or stop more effective and efficient delivery of local government services. The Council will examine various statutory or regulatory obstacles to alternative service delivery approaches and financing arrangements. In 1993 the Council will do the same for counties and school districts.
- The Council will develop models on redesigning local government service delivery and models on what services are best delivered by whom. The Council will also help local governments implement the models. This will be the topic of the second forum, to be held in October 1992.
- The Council will identify and evaluate emerging regional issues. If there are local services which need to be delivered on a regional basis, they will be identified and alternative structures will be proposed.

The Council will carry out this work with the help of an advisory committee of local government officials, Council members, and other policy leaders in the community. It will continue to provide staff support to efforts already under way. For example, Council human services staff are working with five northwest Hennepin suburban communities and their school districts to design ways to collaborate in providing housing and services--like transportation and early childhood education--to people with low incomes. If time permits in 1992, the Council will also look for opportunities to share services among regional agencies.

Revision of the *Metropolitan Development and Investment Framework* - The Council will revise the MDIF, its plan for promoting orderly development of the region's physical infrastructure. The revisions will take into account new regional forecasts for population, household and employment growth based on the 1990 census. They will address potential expansions of the metropolitan urban service area and where future sewer lines and highways may be needed. The revisions will also incorporate the concept of a potential new airport for the region. The focus of the MDIF will likely be broadened to include the interrelationships of physical and human-service planning. The revised plan will also include policies for strengthening the central cities and older, inner-ring suburbs in the Metro Area.

800-Megahertz Trunked Radio Project - The Council, advised by its radio communications task force, will report to the legislature on the need for and feasibility of a region-wide trunked radio system for local governments and recommend a governance structure and financing mechanism.

Parks - The major focus of the parks program will be to improve the regional park trail system.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

In addition to adopting regional policies and major reports described above, the Council in 1991 engaged in a variety of activities to carry out its regional mission. Following is a snapshot of some of this work.

Metro HRA - The Council's Metropolitan Housing and Redevelopment Authority distributed \$18.6 million in rent assistance payments to provide affordable housing to 4,185 households in 140 communities. The HRA achieved 98 percent of its planned utilization of certificates and vouchers in 1991. In addition, the HRA began administering the new federal "portability" legislation, allowing Section 8 recipients to take their certificates to locations outside the seven-county Metro Area. Approximately 450 clients have taken advantage of the new provisions. In 1991 the HRA also initiated several new program elements, including dedication of: 24 vouchers for people who are mentally ill and homeless; 72 certificates and vouchers for families who are participating in programs leading to economic independence and self sufficiency; and 12 certificates for use by families displaced by natural disaster or government action.

1990 Census Data - The Council's Data Center and Research Divisions in 1991 put census data into usable formats, analyzed the data and distributed it to businesses, local governments, nonprofit organizations and the general public. The Council also completed an updated regional geographic base file, incorporating 1990 census data, for use by the legislature to draw new legislative districts. The research division used the census data to develop new regional population, household and employment forecasts through 2010.

Metropolitan Significance Review - The Council undertook a metropolitan significance review of a proposed sand and gravel mining operation in Shakopee at the request of Prior Lake. The review was suspended when the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community Business Council decided to purchase the land on which the mining operation was to have been established.

Grants for Services for Elderly People - As the designated Area Agency on Aging, the Council allocated and distributed \$5 million in state and federal funds to sustain a wide variety of supportive services for older people in the region in 1992. Most of the funds will be used for congregate dining, home-delivered meals, transportation and other supportive services.

Parks Funding - The Council authorized \$4.9 million in grants from state bond proceeds to regional park implementing agencies for acquisition and development of land in several parks, including Minneapolis Chain of Lakes, Lake Minnetonka and Big Marine. Another \$1.4 million will be allocated to either acquiring the Burlington Northern Regional Trail or further development of Como Regional Park. The Council also distributed \$2.8 million in state funds to park agencies to help pay operation and maintenance costs. The aid amounted to about eight percent of the total cost to operate and maintain regional parks in 1991. The Council issued \$15 million of its own bonds for grants to regional park agencies for park and trail acquisition and development projects, property tax equivalency payments, grant administration, and emergency acquisition of land not financed under other grants. The funds were allocated in 1990.

Table 1
 METROPOLITAN AGENCIES
 1991 AND 1992 AGENCY BUDGETS

| | <u>1991</u> | <u>1992</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|
| Metropolitan Council | 16,542,000 | 15,389,000 |
| Metropolitan Airports Commission | 71,936,000 | 78,974,000 |
| Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission | 19,317,000 | 20,952,000 |
| Metropolitan Waste Control Commission | 128,518,000 | 139,110,000 |
| Regional Transit Board | 3,128,000 | 3,484,000 |
| Metropolitan Transit Commission | 114,838,000 | 116,993,000 |

Sources: 1992 Proposed or Approved Budgets

Agency expenses for the Metropolitan Council reflect agency operations only and exclude passthrough expenses.

Agency expenses for the Regional Transit Board reflect agency operations only and exclude transit assistance payments to the Metropolitan Transit Commission and other transit providers. Transit assistance payments total \$89.2 million in 1991 and \$90.1 million in 1992.

Agency expenses for the Airports Commission include depreciation and bond interest. Agency expenses for the Waste Control and Sports Facilities Commission Commissions include debt service payments. Agency expenses for the Transit Commission include operating expenses only and exclude capital and debt service expenses.

Table 2

Metropolitan Council
1991 BUDGET-Revenue and Expenditures by Department
Agency Operations*

| | Human Services | | Metro Systems | Research/ Long-Range Planning | Community Services | Admini- stration | Chair's Office | Non- departmental | All Other than HRA | Total Council |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | Metro HRA | Other Human Services | | | | | | | | |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal | \$2,174,832 | \$509,914 | \$1,102,047 | | | | | | 1,611,961 | \$3,786,793 |
| State | \$8,353 | \$145,839 | \$1,916,277 | | | \$25,110 | | | 2,087,226 | \$2,095,579 |
| Regional Agencies | | | \$490,364 | \$214,853 | | \$68,415 | \$25,868 | \$54,553 | 854,053 | \$854,053 |
| Interest Income | \$36,000 | \$25,000 | | | | | | \$295,000 | 320,000 | \$356,000 |
| Use of Reserves | | | | | | | | | 0 | \$0 |
| Other Miscellaneous | \$68,048 | \$25,000 | \$643,106 | | \$46,800 | \$43,054 | | \$227,100 | 985,060 | \$1,053,108 |
| Total External Revenue | \$2,287,233 | \$705,753 | \$4,151,794 | \$214,853 | \$46,800 | \$136,579 | \$25,868 | \$576,653 | \$5,858,300 | \$8,145,533 |
| Internal Rev.- User Charges | | | | | | | | \$444,537 | 444,537 | \$444,537 |
| Property Tax Levy | \$0 | \$1,548,864 | \$2,383,510 | \$1,777,898 | \$1,062,359 | (\$4,888) | \$1,129,378 | \$0 | 7,897,121 | \$7,897,121 |
| Total Revenues and Other | \$2,287,233 | \$2,254,617 | \$6,535,304 | \$1,992,751 | \$1,109,159 | \$131,691 | \$1,155,246 | \$1,021,190 | \$14,199,958 | \$16,487,191 |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Benefits | \$1,027,215 | \$1,102,536 | \$2,221,390 | \$1,100,800 | \$900,354 | \$1,641,050 | \$857,000 | \$417,200 | 8,240,330 | \$9,267,545 |
| HRA Administrative Fee | \$491,134 | | | | | | | | 0 | \$491,134 |
| Consultant | \$0 | \$181,839 | \$2,392,519 | \$22,500 | \$25,000 | 26,209 | \$46,445 | \$29,233 | 2,723,745 | \$2,723,745 |
| Travel | \$9,760 | \$14,762 | \$22,427 | \$4,050 | \$2,595 | \$3,083 | \$13,630 | \$0 | 60,547 | \$70,307 |
| Printing Services | \$30,369 | \$74,225 | \$97,010 | \$13,410 | \$154,930 | \$23,609 | \$23,470 | \$6,000 | 392,654 | \$423,023 |
| Computer Services | \$23,587 | \$28,731 | \$88,595 | \$54,979 | \$55,486 | \$105,121 | \$18,485 | \$0 | 351,397 | \$374,984 |
| Other Direct Expenditures | \$113,317 | \$97,888 | \$176,538 | \$27,910 | \$144,409 | \$311,405 | \$244,060 | \$178,266 | 1,180,476 | \$1,293,793 |
| Overhead/Facilities | \$97,085 | \$103,116 | \$183,433 | \$94,466 | \$145,981 | \$189,598 | \$103,852 | \$0 | 820,446 | \$917,531 |
| New Capital and Debt Service | | | | | | | | 535,590 | 535,590 | \$535,590 |
| User Charges (Depreciation) | 20,220 | \$26,400 | \$93,900 | \$50,500 | \$47,510 | \$162,807 | \$28,500 | \$14,700 | 424,317 | \$444,537 |
| Total Direct Expenditures | \$1,812,687 | \$1,629,497 | \$5,275,812 | \$1,368,615 | \$1,476,265 | \$2,462,882 | \$1,335,442 | \$1,180,989 | \$14,729,502 | \$16,542,189 |
| Cost Center Indirect Expense | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$672,043) | (\$2,387,550) | (\$349,189) | (\$385,000) | (3,793,782) | (\$3,793,782) |
| Indirect Expense Allocation to Line Programs | \$582,414 | \$625,120 | \$1,259,492 | \$624,136 | \$304,937 | \$56,359 | \$341,324 | \$0 | 3,211,368 | \$3,793,782 |
| Total Department Expense | 2,395,101 | 2,254,617 | 6,535,304 | 1,992,751 | 1,109,159 | 131,691 | 1,327,577 | 795,989 | 14,147,088 | 16,542,189 |
| Net Surplus/(Deficit) | (107,868) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (172,331) | 225,201 | 52,870 | (54,998) |

*This is the amended budget reflecting Council action on amendments through October 31, 1991.

Table 3

Metropolitan Council
1991 Earned Revenue and Actual Expenditures by Department
As of September 30, 1991

| | Human Services | | Metro Systems | Research/ Long-Range Planning | Community Services | Admini- stration | Chair's Office | Non- departmental | All Other than HRA | Total |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | Metro HRA | Other Human Services | | | | | | | | |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal | \$1,588,546 | \$368,264 | \$682,542 | | | | | | 1,050,806 | \$2,639,352 |
| State | \$2,505 | \$92,010 | \$766,821 | | | \$25,110 | | | 883,941 | \$886,446 |
| Regional Agencies | | | \$400,554 | \$194,812 | | \$9,386 | \$9,560 | \$40,733 | 655,045 | \$655,045 |
| Interest Income | \$10,000 | \$29,709 | | | | | | \$109,338 | 139,047 | \$149,047 |
| Other Miscellaneous | \$1,800 | \$72,900 | \$254,399 | | \$31,243 | \$18,965 | | \$227,100 | 604,607 | \$606,407 |
| Use of Reserves | 169,850 | | | | | | | | 0 | \$169,850 |
| Total External Revenue | \$1,772,701 | \$562,883 | \$2,104,316 | \$194,812 | \$31,243 | \$53,461 | \$9,560 | \$377,171 | \$3,333,446 | \$5,106,147 |
| Internal Rev.- User Charges | | | | | | | | \$394,700 | 394,700 | \$394,700 |
| Property Tax Levy | \$0 | | | | | | | \$3,896,021 | 3,896,021 | \$3,896,021 |
| Total Revenues and Other | \$1,772,701 | \$562,883 | \$2,104,316 | \$194,812 | \$31,243 | \$53,461 | \$9,560 | \$4,667,892 | \$7,624,167 | \$9,396,868 |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Benefits | 675,329 | 742,952 | 1,588,385 | 825,963 | 650,575 | 1,177,777 | \$650,474 | 336,543 | 5,972,670 | \$6,647,999 |
| HRA Administrative Fees | 481,777 | 0 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | \$481,777 |
| Consultant | 0 | 113,203 | 1,735,439 | 24,140 | 950 | 15,369 | \$46,714 | 27,000 | 1,962,814 | \$1,962,814 |
| Travel | 7,410 | 5,962 | 13,305 | 2,098 | 1,529 | 1,888 | \$5,272 | 0 | 30,054 | \$37,463 |
| Printing Services | 23,036 | 25,250 | 46,903 | 8,259 | 101,359 | 28,822 | \$7,400 | 1,958 | 219,951 | \$242,988 |
| Overhead | 63,138 | 63,447 | 119,567 | 61,676 | 96,437 | 143,871 | \$68,299 | 48,303 | 601,600 | \$664,738 |
| Computer Services | 29,487 | 19,360 | 45,652 | 24,429 | 33,241 | 101,096 | \$11,869 | 2,176 | 237,823 | \$267,310 |
| Other Direct Expenditures | 81,523 | 87,380 | 50,735 | 21,091 | 129,238 | 210,114 | \$261,674 | 185,282 | 945,514 | \$1,027,036 |
| New Capital and Debt Service | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 306,730 | 306,730 | \$306,730 |
| User Charges(Depreciation) | 20,779 | 31,020 | 68,106 | 33,855 | 44,056 | 150,420 | \$25,397 | 151 | 353,004 | \$373,783 |
| Total Direct Expenditures | 1,382,477 | \$1,088,575 | \$3,668,092 | \$1,001,512 | \$1,057,383 | \$1,829,357 | \$1,077,099 | \$908,142 | \$10,630,160 | \$12,012,637 |
| Cost Center Indirect Expense | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | (\$455,463) | (\$1,761,081) | (\$255,025) | (\$306,467) | (2,778,036) | (\$2,778,036) |
| Indirect Expense Allocation to Line Programs | \$390,224 | \$429,299 | \$917,814 | \$477,265 | \$232,990 | \$56,830 | \$273,614 | | 2,387,812 | \$2,778,036 |
| Total Department Expense | 1,772,701 | 1,517,874 | 4,585,906 | 1,478,777 | 834,910 | 125,106 | 1,095,688 | 601,675 | 10,239,936 | 12,012,637 |
| Net Surplus(Deficit)* | 0 | (954,991) | (2,481,590) | (1,283,965) | (803,667) | (71,645) | (1,086,128) | 4,066,217 | (2,615,769) | (2,615,769) |

*This is a timing deficit due primarily to the payment schedule for property taxes. One half (approximately \$3,900,000) of the tax levy is not collected as of 9/30/91.

Table 4

Metropolitan Council
1992 BUDGET-Revenues and Expenditures
Agency Operations

| | Human Services | | Metro Systems | Research/ Long-Range Planning | Community Services | Admini- stration | Chair's Office | Non- departmental | All Other than HRA | Total Council |
|---|----------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | Metro HRA | Other Human Services | | | | | | | | |
| REVENUES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal | 2,264,827 | 611,486 | 600,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,211,486 | \$3,476,313 |
| State | 7,425 | 0 | 850,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 850,000 | \$857,425 |
| Regional Agencies | 0 | 0 | 551,737 | 264,656 | 0 | 41,642 | 18,719 | 71,000 | 947,754 | \$947,754 |
| Interest Income | 36,000 | 30,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160,000 | 190,000 | \$226,000 |
| Other Miscellaneous | 8,400 | 0 | 1,011,500 | 0 | 36,000 | 0 | 0 | 233,000 | 1,280,500 | \$1,288,900 |
| Use of Reserves | 54,846 | | | | | | | | | \$54,846 |
| Total External Revenue | 2,371,498 | 641,486 | 3,013,237 | 264,656 | 36,000 | 41,642 | 18,719 | 464,000 | 4,479,740 | 6,851,238 |
| Internal Rev.- User Charges | | | | | | | | 445,525 | 445,525 | \$445,525 |
| Property Tax Levy | 0 | 1,702,304 | 2,540,388 | 1,680,710 | 809,825 | 145,030 | 1,158,954 | 124,959 | 8,162,170 | \$8,162,170 |
| Total Revenues and Other | 2,371,498 | 2,343,790 | 5,553,625 | 1,945,366 | 845,825 | 186,672 | 1,177,673 | 1,034,484 | \$13,087,435 | \$15,458,933 |
| EXPENDITURES | | | | | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Benefits | 1,043,100 | 1,332,267 | 2,474,300 | 1,137,800 | 750,200 | 1,385,300 | 995,739 | 590,200 | 8,665,806 | \$9,708,906 |
| HRA Administrative Costs | 457,498 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$457,498 |
| Consultant | 0 | 5,000 | 1,218,790 | 14,500 | 0 | 45,000 | 9,000 | 22,500 | 1,314,790 | \$1,314,790 |
| Travel | 14,375 | 14,506 | 18,610 | 3,950 | 2,820 | 2,560 | 12,000 | 0 | 54,446 | \$68,821 |
| Printing Services | 29,720 | 66,210 | 81,430 | 17,600 | 107,760 | 35,990 | 12,880 | 2,000 | 323,870 | \$353,590 |
| Computer Services | 26,107 | 23,114 | 86,842 | 34,857 | 41,285 | 116,599 | 17,311 | 0 | 320,007 | \$346,115 |
| Other Direct Expenditures | 133,690 | 82,645 | 135,621 | 19,865 | 129,785 | 201,120 | 263,353 | 357,446 | 1,189,835 | \$1,323,525 |
| Building Rent and Utilities | 97,799 | \$104,752 | 185,552 | 95,487 | 149,529 | 169,523 | 129,622 | 29,000 | 863,464 | \$961,264 |
| Fixed Assets - New Capital | 0 | \$0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 408,900 | 408,900 | \$408,900 |
| User Charges (Depreciation) | 32,950 | \$30,377 | 80,440 | 36,363 | 51,933 | 170,197 | 43,265 | 0 | 412,575 | \$445,525 |
| Total Expenditures | 1,835,240 | 1,658,871 | 4,281,585 | 1,360,422 | 1,233,312 | 2,126,289 | 1,483,169 | 1,410,046 | \$13,553,694 | \$15,388,933 |
| Cost Center Indirect Expense | | | | | -595,183 | -1,993,443 | -593,496 | -459,700 | -3,641,823 | (\$3,641,823) |
| Indirect Expense Allocation to Line Programs | 536,259 | 684,920 | 1,272,040 | 584,944 | 207,697 | 53,826 | 287,999 | 14,138 | 3,105,564 | \$3,641,823 |
| Total Department Expense | 2,371,498 | 2,343,790 | 5,553,625 | 1,945,366 | 845,825 | 186,672 | 1,177,673 | 964,484 | 13,017,435 | 15,388,933 |
| Net Surplus(Deficit) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70,000 | 70,000 | 70,000 |

Metropolitan Council
1991 Annual Report to the Legislature
Appendix

January 15, 1992

Metropolitan Council
Mears Park Centre
230 E. Fifth St., St. Paul 55101
612 291-6359
TDD 291-0904

Publication No. 310-92-002

Referral Appendix for Annual Report
 Referrals Received December 31, 1990 Through December 31, 1991

I. Federal Grant and Loan Requests
A. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 15325-1 | JORDAN INDUSTRIAL PARK - INSTALLATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES | Qualified Favorable |

I. Federal Grant and Loan Requests
B. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
1. Housing Subdivision Program

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 15308-1 | RIVER INC. SF 51-91-DC, WILDWOOD SPRINGS, 27 LOTS, DAYTON | Unfavorable |
| 15315-1 | NORTH SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 53-91-DC, SUNRISE MEADOWS, 37 LOTS, WOODBURY | Favorable |
| 15328-1 | UNITED MORTGAGE CORP. SF 58-91-DC, COUNTRY PLACE 2ND, 49 LOTS, WOODBURY | Favorable |
| 15329-1 | HAGEN, HANS HOMES, INC. SF 59-91-DC, CHERRY HILL FARM 4TH, 24 LOTS, MEDINA | Favorable |
| 15332-1 | BUILDERS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 56-91-DC, HEATHER RIDGE, 84 LOTS, OAKDALE | Favorable |
| 15338-1 | FITZGERALD, M. CONSTRUCTION & JUSTIN HOME BUILDERS, INC. SF 69-91-DC, BRANDYWOOD ESTATES, 70 LOTS, LINO LAKES | Favorable |
| 15349-1 | THOMPSON LAND DEVELOPMENT SF 66-91-DC, COLBY LAKE 10TH, 37 LOTS, WOODBURY | Favorable |
| 15350-1 | LIDA CONSTRUCTION SF 71-91-DC, WOODBRIDGE VILLAGE TOWNHOMES, 31 LOTS, COON RAPIDS | Favorable |
| 15351-1 | JUSTIN PROPERTIES CONTRACTING, INC. SF 73-91-DC, LYTON PARK PLACE, 21 LOTS, ST. PAUL | Qualified Favorable |
| 15352-1 | NEW HORIZON HOMES, INC. SF 76-91-DC, WESCOTT SQUARE TOWNHOMES, 67 LOTS, EAGAN | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----------|
| 15377-1 | GRAHAM DEVELOPMENT CO. SF 75-91-DC, HERITAGE WOODS ESTATES 2ND, 61 LOTS, PLYMOUTH | Favorable |
| 15378-1 | CORNERSTONE DEVELOPMENT SF 78-91-SX, BAVARIA PLACE, 30 LOTS, CHASKA | Favorable |
| 15379-1 | HEDLUND PLANNING ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC. SF 83-91-DC, MEADOW WOOD OF CHAMPLIN 3RD, 10 LOTS, CHAMPLIN | Favorable |
| 15387-1 | PROGRESS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 84-91-DC, HIGHLAND POND 2ND, 25 LOTS, SAVAGE | Favorable |
| 15388-1 | ESSEX DEVELOPMENT CORP. SF 92-91-DC, HAMPTON POND 3RD, 26 LOTS, SAVAGE | Favorable |
| 15389-1 | JASPER DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 91-91-DC, RAVENWOOD 2ND, 21 LOTS, WACONIA | Favorable |
| 15390-1 | MAMER CONSTRUCTION SF 93-91-DC, CRESTVIEW ESTATES, 18 LOTS, JORDAN | Favorable |
| 15392-1 | UNITED MORTGAGE CORP. SF 95-91-DC, HILLS OF STONEBRIDGE 3RD, 74 LOTS, EAGAN | Favorable |
| 15402-1 | LYMAN DEVELOPMENT SF 99-91-DC, BRIGHTONS LANDING 2ND, 74 LOTS, WOODBURY | Favorable |
| 15403-1 | HOKANSON DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 100 & 101-91-DC, WENZEL FARMS, 100 SF & 75TH, LINO LAKES | Favorable |
| 15433-1 | DIAMOND DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 113-91-DC, WEAVER LAKE HIGHLANDS 3RD, 41 LOTS, MAPLE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15434-1 | DIAMOND DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 114-91-DC, WEAVER LAKE HIGHLANDS 4TH, 45 LOTS, MAPLE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15435-1 | BROOK PARK REALTY, INC. SF 117-91-DC, MINERAL POND 5TH, 15 LOTS, ANOKA | Favorable |
| 15443-1 | TWIN VIEW DEVELOPMENT SF 118-91-DC, TWIN VIEW MEADOWS, 25 LOTS, BROOKLYN CENTER | Favorable |
| 15444-1 | ESSEX DEVELOPMENT CORP. SF 128-91-DC, HAMPTON POND 4TH, 10 LOTS, SAVAGE | Favorable |
| 15452-1 | BROOK PARK REALTY, INC. SF 129-91-DC, HIGHLANDS OF EDINBURGH 8TH, 63 LOTS, BROOKLYN PARK | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|-------------|
| 15453-1 | LAURENT BUILDERS, INC. SF 135-91-DC, LIBERTY HEIGHTS 6TH, 28 LOTS, CHASKA | Favorable |
| 15456-1 | BROOK PARK REALTY, INC. SF 130-91-DC, THE ISLES OF WIGHT, 33 LOTS, BROOKLYN PARK | Favorable |
| 15457-1 | GILES, MIKE & KLOTZ, GLENN SF 133-91-DC, HUNTINGTON ESTATES 4TH, 32 LOTS, SAVAGE | Favorable |
| 15458-1 | KENCO CONSTRUCTION, INC. SF 134-91-DC, EAST MEADOW CLIFF, 101 LOTS, COTTAGE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15459-1 | UNITED MORTGAGE CORP. SF 137-91-DC, COVENTRY PASS 3RD, 41 LOTS, EAGAN | Favorable |
| 15460-1 | GAGNAN DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 142-91-DC, QUAIL POINTE 2ND, 33 LOTS, BLAINE | Favorable |
| 15469-1 | MAPLEWOOD DEVELOPMENT & CONSTRUCTION, INC. SF 159-91-DC, WATERVIEW HILL, 26 LOTS, NORTH ST. PAUL | Favorable |
| 15475-1 | ANDERSON, ORAL C. & NADENE L. SF 145-91-DC, OAKVIEW MEADOWS 2ND, 13 LOTS, HAM LAKE | Unfavorable |
| 15476-1 | JOHNSON, DEAN R. CONSTRUCTION, INC. SF 150-91-DC, BRITTANY GABLES, 14 LOTS, BURNSVILLE | Favorable |
| 15477-1 | SUNSET HOMES CORP. SF 158-91-DC, EDENVALE GLEN TOWNHOUSES, 16 UNITS, EDEN PRAIRIE | Favorable |
| 15481-1 | ZAWISTOWSKI, STANLEY SF 165-91-DC, PONDS OF SHENANDOAH, 83 LOTS, COON RAPIDS | Favorable |
| 15482-1 | CARLSON DROPPS ASSOCIATES SF 166-91-DC, PINE RIDGE, 58 LOTS, LINO LAKES | Favorable |
| 15488-1 | THOMPSON, ORRIN HOMES SF 170-91-DC, BRIDLEWOOD FARM, 68 LOTS, PLYMOUTH | Favorable |
| 15489-1 | REHBEIN, GERALD SF 164-91-DC, CENTER HILLS 2ND, 40 LOTS, CENTERVILLE | Favorable |
| 15490-1 | GOOD VALUE HOMES, INC. SF 104-91-DC, OAKDALE MEADOWS 15TH, 34 LOTS, OAKDALE | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|-------------|
| 15491-1 | CREEKVIEW CROSSING PARTNERSHIP SF 141-91-DC, CREEKVIEW CROSSING, 85 LOTS, ANDOVER | Favorable |
| 15497-1 | LAURENT BUILDERS, INC. SF 182-91-DC, EAGEL CREEK, 22 LOTS, SHAKOPEE | Favorable |
| 15498-1 | THOMPSON, ORRIN E. CONSTRUCTION CORP. SF 183-91-DC, PINE MEADOW, 56 LOTS, COTTAGE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15499-1 | NORTH SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 180-91-DC, GREENBROOK RIDGE 2ND, 31 LOTS, EAST BETHEL | Unfavorable |
| 15500-1 | GROUND DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 179-91-DC, CEDARGLEN 3RD, LAKEVILLE | Favorable |
| 15503-1 | CHAZIN, NORMAN SF 190-91-DC, ESTATES OF EDINBURGH 3RD, BROOKLYN PARK | Favorable |
| 15504-1 | BUILDERS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 189-91-DC, HAZELTINE BLUFF 2ND & 3RD, CHASKA | Favorable |
| 15505-1 | ARGUS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 188-91-DC, CHERRY RIDGE 2ND, 23 LOTS, LAKEVILLE | Favorable |
| 15506-1 | GROUND DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 186-91-DC, HIGHLANDS OF STILLWATER, 33 LOTS, STILLWATER | Favorable |
| 15507-1 | ARGUS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 184-91-DC, PINES OF INVERNESS 2ND, 25 LOTS, WOODBURY | Favorable |
| 15508-1 | ARGUS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 191-91-DC, LAKE SUSAN HILLS WEST 7TH, 60 LOTS, CHANHASSEN | Favorable |
| 15514-1 | ARGUS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 193-91-DC, LAKE SUSAN HILLS WEST 6TH, 12 LOTS, CHANHASSEN | Favorable |
| 15515-1 | WENSMANN REALTY SF 194-91-DC, ROYAL WOODS 2ND, 44 LOTS, LAKEVILLE | Favorable |
| 15516-1 | HEDLUND ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC. SF 196-91-DC, MEADOW WOOD OF CHAMPLIN 2ND, CHAMPLIN | Favorable |
| 15517-1 | WENSMANN HOMES SF 197-91-DC, PILOT KNOB ESTATES 7TH ADDITION, 48 LOTS, APPLE VALLEY | Favorable |
| 15522-1 | ACORN INVESTMENTS, INC. SF 201-91-DC, BIRCH WOOD ACRES, 135 LOTS, LINO LAKES | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|-------------------|
| 15532-1 | LUND, JAMES CONSTRUCTION, INC. SF 203-91-DC, EAST PARKVIEW 5TH, 13 LOTS, COTTAGE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15533-1 | WINKLER DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 204-91-DC, APPLE PONDS 3RD, 63 LOTS, APPLE VALLEY | Favorable |
| 15536-1 | PROGRESS DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 206-91-DC, MEADOW BROOK 3RD, 40 LOTS, LAKEVILLE | Favorable |
| 15537-1 | GOLD NUGGET DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 207-91-DC, KNOLLWOOD 2ND ADDITION, 37 LOTS, COTTAGE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15564-1 | LYMAN DEVELOPMENT CO. SF 4-92-DC, WOODBRIDGE PONDS & WOODBRIDGE PONDS 2ND, 52 LOTS, SAVAGE | Favorable |
| 15565-1 | GOOD VALUE HOMES, INC. SF 5-92-DC, CHESTNUT POND, 17 LOTS, RAMSEY | Favorable |
| 15566-1 | GOOD VALUE HOMES, INC. SF 6-92-DC, CHESTNUT HILL, 100 LOTS, RAMSEY | Favorable |
| 15567-1 | GOOD VALUE HOMES, INC. SF 7-92-DC, KINGSTON COURT, 44 LOTS, OAKDALE | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15568-1 | THE ROTTLUND CO., INC. SF 8-92-DC, DIFFLEY COMMONS-ATRIUM TOWNHOMES, 40 LOTS, EAGAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15569-1 | BAUER, GERALD SF 11-92-DC, HUNTERS RIDGE, 77 LOTS, RAMSEY | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15575-1 | DOLAN, DAN DEVELOPMENT SF 3-92-DC, TOWNHOMES OF EVERGREEN 3RD, 15 LOTS, WOODBURY | Favorable |
| 15576-1 | U.S. HOME CORPORATION SF 17-92-DC, COUNTRY HILLS 4TH, 31 LOTS, ROSEMOUNT | Favorable |
| 15577-1 | WISEN, KENNETH R. SF 18-92-DC, WISEN 11TH, 26 LOTS, HAM LAKE | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15578-1 | THE ROTTLUND CO., INC. SF 21-92-DC, RICE LAKE WOODS PLAT TWENTY, 55 LOTS, MAPLE GROVE | Favorable |
| 15579-1 | INTEGRITY DEVELOPMENT, INC. SF 19-92-DC, VANTAGE POINT 4TH & 5TH, 57 LOTS, COTTAGE GROVE | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|-------------------|
| 15585-1 | CHERRY HILL BUILDERS, INC. SF 28-92-DC, CHERRY HILL 8TH, 36 LOTS, MINNETONKA | Favorable |
| 15589-1 | SIENNA CORPORATION SF 16-92-DC, CARRIAGE FARMS 6TH, 23 LOTS, WOODBURY | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15590-1 | SIENNA CORPORATION SF 27-92-DC, CHAPEL HILLS 3RD, 60 LOTS, LAKEVILLE | Favorable |
| 15591-1 | LIDA CONSTRUCTION SF 29-92-DC, WOODBRIDGE VILLAGE, 30 LOTS, COON RAPIDS | Favorable |
| 15593-1 | ROTTLUND CO., INC. SF 30-92-DC, CONCORDIA MEADOWS ATRIUM TOWNHOMES, 24 LOTS, ROSEVILLE | Favorable |

I. Federal Grant and Loan Requests

B. U.S Dept. of Housing and Urban Development

2. Multiple (221d4), Public Elderly & Handicapped Housing Program (202)

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 15311-1 | BRANDT, JACK 221D4,WATERPARK TOWNHOMES,42 UNITS,APPLE VALLEY,PROJECT NO.092-35497 | Favorable |
| 15312-1 | BRANDT, JACK 221D4, FERNBROOK TOWNHOMES, 72 UNITS, PLYMOUTH, PROJECT NO. 092-35498 | Favorable |
| 15341-1 | MINNEAPOLIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY SRO MODERATE REHAB., HOMELESS, 66 S. 12TH ST. AND 706 FIRST AVE. N. | Favorable |
| 15362-1 | RILEY, JAMES R. 221D4, SALEM GREEN APARTMENTS,320 UNITS,INVER GROVE HEIGHTS,092-35499 | Favorable |
| 15437-1 | MINNESOTA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP 221D4, PARK HEIGHTS APARTMENTS, 108 UNITS, INVER GROVE HEIGHTS | Favorable |
| 15448-1 | NORTH RIDGE APARTMENTS, MINNESOTA GENERAL PARTNERSHIP 221D4, NORTH RIDGE APARTMENTS, 64 UNITS, ARDEN HILLS, 092-35502 | Favorable |
| 15543-1 | WESTMINSTER CORP. 811 CAPITAL ADVANCE, FOUR SEASONS COMMUNITY HOUSING, 7 UNITS, CRYSTAL | Favorable |
| 15544-1. | ACCESSIBLE SPACE, INC. 811 CAPITAL ADVANCE, ASI-DAKOTA COUNTY, 24 UNITS, BURNSVILLE | Favorable |
| 15545-1 | NATIONAL HANDICAP HOUSING INSTITUTE, INC. 811 CAPITAL ADVANCE, NHHI-BARRIER FREE HOUSING, 24 UNITS, HOPKINS | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|-----------|
| 15546-1 | WESTMINSTER CORP. 811 CAPITAL ADVANCE, FORD HOUSE, 11 UNITS, MINNEAPOLIS | Favorable |
| 15549-1 | THE KELLY INSTITUTE 811 CAPITAL ADVANCE, KELLY APARTMENTS, 6 UNITS, ST. LOUIS PARK | Favorable |
| 15563-1 | ST. LOUIS PARK LOW INCOME PUBLIC HOUSING, 15 UNITS, MN46-P144-005-F | Favorable |
| 15438-1 | WESTMINSTER CORP. 202, HOUSING FOR THE MENTALLY ILL, 7 UNITS, BLOOMINGTON | Favorable |
| 15472-1 | WESTMINSTER CORP. 202, METRO APARTMENTS, 24 UNITS, BLOOMINGTON, 092-HH011-CMI | Favorable |
| 15542-1 | EBENEZER SOCIETY 202, EBENEZER RIDGES MANOR, 41 UNITS, BURNSVILLE, 092-EE002-WAC | Favorable |
| 15547-1 | WESTMINSTER CORP. 202 CAPITAL ADVANCE, LINCOLN PARK MANOR, 50 UNITS, OAKDALE | Favorable |
| 15548-1 | NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING FOUNDATION 202 CAPITAL ADVANCE, ELDERS LODGE, 45 UNITS, ST. PAUL | Favorable |

I. Federal Grant and Loan Requests
C. U.S. Dept. of Transportation
1. Highway Programs

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 15282-2 | TAB NICOLLET TRANSIT MALL SHUTTLE PROJECT, PHASE II | Qualified Favorable |
| 15357-1 | TAB FAU FUNDING ALLOCATION FOR MINNESOTA RIDESHARE (90-25) | Favorable |
| 15357-2 | TAB 1991-93 TIP AMENDMENT, RIDESHARE | Favorable |
| 15357-3 | TAB 1991-93 TIP AMENDMENT, I-335 INTERSTATE SUBSTITUTION PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15413-1 | TAB FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION CHANGE REQUESTS - 91-1 | Favorable |

| | | | |
|---------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| 15509-1 | TAB | 1992 UPWP (91-7) | Favorable |
| 15560-1 | TAB | 1992 - 1994 TIP | Favorable |
| 15597-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | 1992-1997 HIP | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15493-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | CR 64, LOCATED BETWEEN CSAH 15 & CSAH 5 | Favorable |
| 15494-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | REPLACE BRIDGE NO. 92236-WESTERN AVENUE FROM COMO AVE. TO ATWATER ST. | Favorable |
| 15573-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION | PROJECT MEMORANDUM REPORT, CSAH 9 LOCATED BETWEEN CSAH 20 & CSAH 22 | Favorable |

II. State Grant and Loan Requests

| | | | |
|---------|---------------|--|-----------|
| 15314-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY | REPLACE BRIDGE NO. 740, OVER VERMILLION RIVER CSAH 68 | Favorable |
| 15447-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY | REPLACE BRIDGE L-3251, 225TH STREET S. OVER VERMILLION RIVER | Favorable |
| 15449-1 | ST. PAUL | REPLACE BRIDGE 62501, SELBY AVENUE | Favorable |
| 15454-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY | REPLACE BRIDGE L-3288 - MICHAEL AVENUE | Favorable |
| 15455-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY | REPLACE BRIDGE L-3282 - GAYLORD AVENUE | Favorable |
| 15470-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY | REPLACE BRIDGE L3191 - CSAH 88 | Favorable |
| 15471-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY | REPLACE BRIDGE L3218 - CR 62 | Favorable |

III. Independent & Metropolitan Agency Plans and Programs
A. Independent Agency (Watershed Management) Plans

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 15370-1 | NORTH CANNON RIVER WATERSHED MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN | Unfavorable |
| 15450-1 | LOWER MINNESOTA RIVER WATERSHED DISTRICT OVERALL PLAN AND 509 PLAN | Favorable |

III. Independent & Metropolitan Agency Plans & Programs
B. Metropolitan Agency Plans and Programs

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 14858-6 | MWCC AMEND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, WAYZATA LIFT STATION & BROOKLYN PARK | Favorable |
| 14858-8 | MWCC AMEND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - PHOSPHOUS REMOVAL PLANT | Favorable |
| 14858-9 | MWCC AMEND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, MWWTP RAS PUMP REPLACEMENT | Favorable |
| 15427-1 | MWCC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - 1992-2010 | Qualified Favorable |
| 15427-2 | MWCC AMEND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 1992-2010 | Qualified Favorable |
| 15584-1 | MWCC AMEND 1991 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - SENECA PLANT | Favorable |
| 14933-2 | RTB AMENDMENT TO FIVE YEAR TRANSIT PLAN - SOUTHWEST METRO CAPITAL FUND | Favorable |
| 15346-1 | RTB FIVE YEAR TRANSIT PLAN - 1991-1995 | Unfavorable |
| 15557-1 | MWCC P&S, N-VIRO SLUDGE MANAGEMENT | Favorable |
| 15558-1 | MWCC P&S, N-VIRO SLUDGE MANAGEMENT, PROCESSING FACILITIES SENECA WWTP | Favorable |

| | | | |
|---------|------|---|-------------------|
| 15559-1 | MWCC | P & S, SENECA SLUDGE HANDLING IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT | Favorable |
| 14858-7 | MWCC | SHAKOPEE LIFT STATION & FORCEMAIN | Favorable |
| 15598-1 | MWCC | SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT STUDY, CHASKA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15596-1 | MAC | 1992 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS, 1993 CIP | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15521-1 | MSFC | 1992 BUDGET | Favorable |

IV. Local Government Plans and Projects
A. Land and School District Plans and Plan Amendment

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 12698-4 | SPRING PARK CP AMENDMENT, 1991 PLAN UPDATE, POLICY PLAN/DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK | Favorable |
| 12884-5 | MINNETRISTA CP AMENDMENT, CR 110 WEST MUSA, 12 ACRES | Favorable |
| 12884-6 | MINNETRISTA CP AMENDMENT, SOUTH HALSTEAD BAY GUIDE PLAN & MUSA AMENDMENT | Qualified Favorable |
| 13601-9 | HASTINGS CP AMENDMENT, EAST 1/2 OF LOT 3, SUNSET VIEW | Favorable |
| 13609-2 | CORCORAN CP AMENDMENT, LAND USE PLAN 1990-2000 (PART I) | Favorable |
| 13701-8 | MINNEAPOLIS CP AMENDMENT, AIRPORT NOISE ELEMENT | Favorable |
| 13849-6 | PRIOR LAKE CP AMENDMENT, ADD 70 ACRES TO MUSA | Unfavorable |
| 13894-8 | CHAMPLIN CP AMENDMENT, BERRY KNOLL - MUSA ADDITION | Favorable |
| 13894-9 | CHAMPLIN CP AMENDMENT, CARTWAY ROAD IMPROVEMENTS | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 14120-6 | LINO LAKES CP AMENDMENT, LAND USE PLAN | Qualified Favorable |
| 14120-7 | LINO LAKES CP AMENDMENT, AMELIA LAKE ESTATES - 53 ACRES | Favorable |
| 14159-6 | SHAKOPEE CP AMENDMENT, 1990-2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 14206-3 | ANDOVER CP AMENDMENT, ADD 84 ACRES TO MUSA | Favorable |
| 14206-4 | ANDOVER CP AMENDMENT, SEWER EXTENSION | In Process Dec 31 |
| 14206-5 | ANDOVER CP AMENDMENT, COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 14241-6 | ST. PAUL CP AMENDMENT, COMPREHENSIVE SEWER PLAN | Favorable |
| 14269-2 | WATERTOWN CP AMENDMENT, 91-2, 6.2 ACRES, AGRICULTURE TO LOW DENISTY | Favorable |
| 14269-3 | WATERTOWN CP AMENDMENT, 91-3, CHANGE LAND USE OF 23 ACRES, CR 24 & CR 10 | Favorable |
| 14417-5 | VADNAIS HEIGHTS CP AMENDMENT, WAL MART PROJECT | In Process Dec 31 |
| 14618-4 | MAPLE GROVE CP AMENDMENT, THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS | Favorable |
| 14735-2 | OAK PARK HEIGHTS CP AMENDMENT, HIGH SCHOOL SITE ANNEXATION AREA | In Process Dec 31 |
| 14880-3 | MENDOTA HEIGHTS CP AMENDMENT, CASE NO. 91-01, ST. PAUL TURNERS GYMNASTICS SOCIETY | Favorable |
| 14901-2 | SOUTH ST. PAUL CP AMENDMENT, TEXT AMENDMENTS AND LAND USE MAP | Favorable |
| 14904-6 | BLOOMINGTON CP AMENDMENT, NORTHWEST AREA DISTRICT PLAN | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|-------------------|
| 14904-7 | BLOOMINGTON CP AMENDMENT, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT ZONES | Favorable |
| 15000-9 | EDEN PRAIRIE CP AMENDMENT, CARPENTER NORTH | Favorable |
| 15005-4 | CHASKA CP AMENDMENT, 2000 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15008-3 | LAKETOWN TWP. CP AMENDMENT, 1991 AMENDMENT - DENSITY OPTION | Favorable |
| 15034-9 | INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CP AMENDMENT, S.E. QUADRANT I494/LAFAYETTE FREEWAY | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15039-8 | APPLE VALLEY CP AMENDMENT, COMPREHENSIVE SEWER POLICY PLAN | Favorable |
| 15039-9 | APPLE VALLEY CP AMENDMENT, GRANADA AVENUE- RETAIL BUSINESS TO GENERAL BUSINESS | Favorable |
| 15087-3 | WHITE BEAR LAKE CP AMENDMENT, REWRITE TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES CHAPTER | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15089-3 | FALCON HEIGHTS CP AMENDMENT, LAND USE PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15093-3 | MEDINA CP AMENDMENT, UPDATE 1980 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (PARTIAL) | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15101-3 | VICTORIA CP AMENDMENT, REVISED MOORES ANNEXATION | Favorable |
| 15104-6 | MAPLEWOOD CP AMENDMENT, LAND USE & ZONING MAP CHANGES - S. MINNEHAHA AVENUE | Favorable |
| 15104-7 | MAPLEWOOD CP AMENDMENT, LAND USE PLAN AND MAP CHANGES | Favorable |
| 15249-2 | PLYMOUTH CP AMENDMENT, LAND USE GUIDE PLAN MAP - 15 ACRES | Favorable |
| 15249-3 | PLYMOUTH CP AMENDMENT, CURTIS LAKE | Favorable |
| 15249-4 | PLYMOUTH CP AMENDMENT, SEVEN PONDS ADDITION | Favorable |

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 15249-5 | PLYMOUTH | CP AMENDMENT, BITOERIN ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15254-4 | WOODBURY | CP AMENDMENT, VOGEL MANUFACTURING | Favorable |
| 15299-4 | EAGAN | CP AMENDMENT, TRANSPORTATION PLAN ELEMENT UPDATE | Withdrawn |
| 15299-5 | EAGAN | CP AMENDMENT, COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE GUIDE PLAN MAP REPRINT | Favorable |
| 15299-6 | EAGAN | CP AMENDMENT, PUBLIC UTILITIES PLAN ELEMENT UPDATE | Withdrawn |
| 15299-7 | EAGAN | CP AMENDMENT, TRANSPORTATION PLAN ELEMENT GOALS & POLICIES | Favorable |
| 15299-8 | EAGAN | CP AMENDMENT, HADLER PARK PLANNED DEVELOPMENT | Qualified Favorable |
| 15300-4 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, KOZLAK'S | Favorable |
| 15300-5 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, POPLAR LAKE - SHERWOOD ROAD | Favorable |
| 15300-6 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, NATURAL LAND USE CATEGORY | Favorable |
| 15300-7 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, TROJOHN AMENDMENT, MAP & TEXT (PDA) | Favorable |
| 15300-8 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, INSTITUTIONAL DEFINITION | Favorable |
| 15300-9 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, TOM THUMB/VOTEL | Favorable |
| 15327-1 | CARVER COUNTY | CP AMENDMENT, JANUARY 1991, EXPANDS AND CLARIFIES CERTAIN POLICIES | Favorable |
| 15327-2 | CARVER COUNTY / BENTON TWP. | CP AMENDMENTS, WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT ELEMENT-BONGARDS SEWER | In Process Dec 31 |

| | | |
|---------|--|-------------------|
| 15331-1 | WATERTOWN CP AMENDMENT, 1991-1, EXTEND SERVICE BOUNDARY FOR MUNICIPAL SEWER | Favorable |
| 15331-2 | WATERTOWN CP AMENDMENT, 91-4-AREA #8 NE CITY LIMITS TRANSITION ZONE | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15333-1 | BROOKLYN CENTER CP AMENDMENT, AREA #18: REDEVELOPMENT/PUD AND/OR LIGHT INDUSTRIAL | Favorable |
| 15339-1 | CHANHASSEN CP AMENDMENT, 1991 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15339-2 | CHANHASSEN CP AMENDMENT, CHES MAR FARM PUD | Favorable |
| 15347-1 | ROSEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, NORTH HEIGHTS HARDWARE | Favorable |
| 15347-2 | ROSEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, CORPUS CHRISTI SUBDIVISION | Favorable |
| 15347-3 | ROSEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, CONCORDIA ROTTLUND DEVELOPMENT | Favorable |
| 15359-1 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, MOUNDSVIEW SCHOOL | Favorable |
| 15360-1 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, BROOKSIDE | Favorable |
| 15360-2 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, KUENZLI | Favorable |
| 15360-3 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, GOSPEL MISSION | Favorable |
| 15360-4 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, MONTESSORI SCHOOL | Favorable |
| 15360-5 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, HOULE/LARSON | Favorable |
| 15360-6 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, SINNA | Favorable |
| 15360-7 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, TAN/REILING | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 15360-8 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, TELEFARM/FABYANSKE | Favorable |
| 15360-9 | SHOREVIEW CP AMENDMENT, I-694/RICE | Favorable |
| 15364-1 | FOREST LAKE CP AMENDMENT, REVISIONS TO AIRPORT ELEMENTS | Favorable |
| 15365-1 | SCOTT COUNTY CP AMENDMENT, SANITARY SEWER ELEMENT | Qualified Favorable |
| 15375-1 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, ISD194 - HIGHVIEW & 175TH | Favorable |
| 15375-2 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, MEADOW BROOK 2ND | Favorable |
| 15375-3 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, CEDAR GLEN 3RD | Favorable |
| 15375-4 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, ISD 194 (HIGH SCHOOL) | Favorable |
| 15401-1 | RANDOLPH TWP. CP AMENDMENT, 1991 ZONING AMENDMENTS | Qualified Favorable |
| 15405-1 | OAKDALE CP AMENDMENT, SECTION 32/33 ANNEXATION AREA | Favorable |
| 15407-1 | LAKE ELMO CP AMENDMENT, PLAN 1990-2010 | Favorable |
| 15407-2 | LAKE ELMO CP AMENDMENT, I-94 MUSA LINE EXPANSION | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15408-1 | MINNETONKA CP AMENDMENT, NORTHWEST SATELLITE FIRE STATION | Favorable |
| 15441-1 | WEST ST. PAUL CP AMENDMENT, REVISED LAND USE PLAN MAP | Favorable |
| 15446-1 | APPLE VALLEY CP AMENDMENT, CONCORD PROPERTY | Favorable |

| | | | |
|---------|-----------|---|-------------------|
| 15468-1 | ROSEMOUNT | CP AMENDMENT, MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL CONTAINMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15468-2 | ROSEMOUNT | CP AMENDMENT, TEXT CLARIFICATION | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15474-1 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, SINNA / LINDIG | Favorable |
| 15474-2 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, MILLER PLAN AMENDMENT | Favorable |
| 15474-3 | SHOREVIEW | CP AMENDMENT, HIGHWAY 49/96 (LESS NW CORNER) | Favorable |
| 15484-1 | CHAMPLIN | CP AMENDMENT, MILL POND SOUTH | Favorable |
| 15484-2 | CHAMPLIN | CP AMENDMENT, BRITTANY COMMERCIAL | Favorable |
| 15501-1 | HOPKINS | CP AMENDMENT, HIGH TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, HIAWATHA AVENUE | Favorable |
| 15502-1 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, ORCHARD OAKS | Favorable |
| 15502-2 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, ROYAL WOODS 2ND ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15502-3 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, CHAPEL HILLS 3RD ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15502-4 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, FAIRFIELD BUSINESS CAMPUS | Favorable |
| 15502-5 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, CHERRY RIDGE 2ND ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15502-6 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, SHADY OAK SHORES 4TH ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15502-7 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, ROLLING OAKS SOUTH PLAT FIVE | Favorable |
| 15502-8 | LAKEVILLE | CP AMENDMENT, MEADOW BROOK 3RD ADDITION | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 15502-9 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, LYNWOOD NORTH 6TH ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15523-1 | EMPIRE TWP. CP AMENDMENT, AIRPORTS | Favorable |
| 15541-1 | HASTINGS CP AMENDMENT, LOTS 1-4, BLOCK 7, ALLISON ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15550-1 | MAY TWP. CP AMENDMENT, REVISED COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15552-1 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, HOMESTEAD CREEK 4TH ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15552-2 | LAKEVILLE CP AMENDMENT, HIGHVIEW HEIGHTS 4TH ADDITION | Favorable |
| 15556-1 | SCIOTA TWP. CP AMENDMENT, RURAL RESIDENCE AMENDMENT | Qualified Favorable |
| 15595-1 | HASSAN TWP. CP AMENDMENT, 1991 COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE UPDATE | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15310-1 | OAK PARK HEIGHTS 392 ACRES, INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT #834 HIGH SCHOOL SITE | Staff Information |
| 15400-2 | CENTERVILLE CONSOLIDATION OF TWO CITIES | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15400-1 | LINO LAKES LAND ANNEXATION | Staff Information |
| 15400-1 | LINO LAKES LAND ANNEXATION | Staff Information |

IV. Local Government Plans and Projects
B. Time Extensions for System Statement Responses

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 13506-4 | FRIDLEY PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |
| 13601-8 | HASTINGS PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----------|
| 14497-9 | ROSEVILLE PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |
| 14859-4 | BLAINE PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |
| 15088-3 | COTTAGE GROVE PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |
| 15094-2 | NORWOOD PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |
| 15101-4 | VICTORIA PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |
| 15431-1 | WASHINGTON COUNTY PLAN EXTENSION, MSS | Favorable |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals

A. Special Transportation Projects

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 15059-3 | WOODBURY CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY APPROVAL I-494 | Qualified Favorable |
| 15345-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SOUTHERLY INTERSECTION ON LAFAYETTE FREEWAY, TH 52/55 | Favorable |
| 15034-8 | INVER GROVE HEIGHTS REQUEST FOR HIGHWAY SYSTEM CHANGE, CSAH 75 AT TH 55 | In Process Dec 31 |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals

B. Land Use Changes - Airport Search Areas

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 15376-1 | CASTLE ROCK TWP. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, HORTICULTURAL GREENHOUSE | Favorable |
| 15404-1 | ROSEMOUNT LAND USE CHANGE, SOLBERG AGGREGATE | Favorable |
| 15404-2 | ROSEMOUNT LAND USE CHANGE, L.H. SOWLES | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|-------------------|
| 15425-1 | CASTLE ROCK TWP. LAND USE CHANGE, MOVE SHED TO 3065 225TH STREET | Favorable |
| 15425-2 | CASTLE ROCK TWP. LAND USE CHANGE, MOVE IN MOBILE HOME WHILE BUILDING NEW HOME | Favorable |
| 15425-3 | CASTLE ROCK TWP. LAND USE CHANGE, RADIO REPAIR BUSINESS | Favorable |
| 15442-1 | EUREKA TWP. LAND USE CHANGE, JOHN FRIEDGES - MINE GRAVEL | Favorable |
| 15478-1 | EMPIRE TWP. LAND USE CHANGE, SOUTHERN TWIN CITIES RADIO | Unfavorable |
| 15553-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY LAND USE CHANGE, SHORELAND ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT | In Process Dec 31 |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals

C. State and Federal Environmental Assessments, Scopings, and Statements

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 14770-3 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DEIS, RUNWAY 4-22 EXTENSION | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15572-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION EA, TH 101 FROM INTERSTATE 94/TH 101 INTERCHANGE | Favorable |
| 14625-3 | DAKOTA COUNTY REGIONAL RAILROAD AUTHORITY EAW/SCOPING DECISION DOCUMENT | Favorable |
| 15309-1 | OAK GROVE TWP. VICTORIA HILLS:DEMOLITION DEBRIS LAND DISPOSAL FACILITY/GOLF COURSE | Qualified Favorable |
| 15335-1 | MINN. POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY EAW, LAKEVILLE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 90-5, TRUNK SEWER EXTENSION | Qualified Favorable |
| 15340-1 | BLOOMINGTON EAW, NORTHWEST AUTOLINK | Favorable |
| 15361-1 | MINNEAPOLIS EAW, UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS, MINNEAPOLIS CAMPUS | Qualified Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|---------------------|
| 15391-1 | MINN. POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY EAW, ROGERS WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY IMPROVEMENT | Favorable |
| 15440-1 | EDEN PRAIRIE EAW, DELL ROAD AND SCENIC HEIGHTS ROAD | Unfavorable |
| 15479-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY RECONSTRUCTION OF CR 46 FROM IPAVA AVE. TO CSAH 23 (CEDAR AVE.) | Qualified Favorable |
| 15480-1 | MAC FLYING CLOUD AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15518-1 | WHITE BEAR TWP. EAW, TARGET MEADOWLANDS | Qualified Favorable |
| 15524-1 | MAC MSP AIRPORT ASSESSMENT | Favorable |
| 15525-1 | MAC ST. PAUL DOWNTOWN ASSESSMENT | Favorable |
| 15526-1 | MAC FLYING CLOUD AIRPORT ASSESSMENT | Favorable |
| 15527-1 | MAC LAKE ELMO AIRPORT ASSESSMENT | Favorable |
| 15528-1 | MAC AIRLAKE AIRPORT ASSESSMENT | Favorable |
| 15529-1 | MAC SUN COUNTRY AIRLINES / HANGAR FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15530-1 | MAC GROUND MSP TRANSPORTATION CENTER & VALET CONSTRUCTION | Favorable |
| 15554-1 | MINN. POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY EAW, ST. FRANCIS WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15561-1 | VADNAIS HEIGHTS EAW, VADNAIS HEIGHTS CENTER | Unfavorable |
| 15571-1 | HENNEPIN COUNTY EAW, RECONSTRUCTION OF HENNEPIN CSAH 62 (TOWNLINER ROAD) | Unfavorable |
| 15602-1 | CHANHASSEN EAW, CHANHASSEN BUSINESS CENTER | In Process Dec 31 |

| | | |
|---------|---|-----------|
| 13128-5 | ST. PAUL FEIS, SHEPARD/WARNER/EAST CBG BYPASS | Favorable |
| 14741-3 | INVER GROVE HEIGHTS FEIS, IGH RESORT COMMUNITY | Favorable |
| 15055-2 | ANOKA COUNTY REGIONAL RAILROAD AUTHORITY DEIS, NORTHEAST CORRIDOR LRT SYSTEM | Favorable |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals
D. Critical Area Plans and Projects

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 14902-2 | SOUTH ST. PAUL MISSISSIPPI RIVER CRITICAL AREA STUDY | Favorable |
| 15206-2 | RAMSEY CRITICAL AREA REVIEW, REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAT, FAYE ADDITION | Qualified Favorable |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals
E. Solid Waste Matters
1. County Solid Waste Plans and Reports

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 15317-2 | WASTE MANAGEMENT OF MINNESOTA, INC. ABROGATE DEVELOPMENT LIMITATION, SITE P, ANOKA REGIONAL LANDFILL | Qualified Favorable |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals
D. Solid Waste Matters
2. Solid Waste Permits, Projects, Ordinances, and Contracts

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 13416-2 | PINE BEND LANDFILL, INC. PINE BEND SANITARY LANDFILL | In Process Dec 31 |
| 13782-3 | NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. HIGH BRIDGE COAL - ASH STORAGE AND TRANSFER FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15535-1 | USPCI, INC. MINNESOTA INDUSTRIAL CONTAINMENT FACILITY, SW-383 | Qualified Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 15316-1 | IMI CORNELIUS, INC. GREENHAVEN GOLF COURSE | Favorable |
| 15317-1 | WASTE MANAGEMENT OF MINNESOTA, INC. ANOKA REGIONAL SANITARY LANDFILL | Qualified Favorable |
| 15318-1 | FULLER, H. B. CO. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15319-1 | ST. PAUL PORT AUTHORITY ENERGY PARK UTILITY CO. | Favorable |
| 15320-1 | NICOLLET PARTNERSHIP GAVIIDAE COMMONS | Favorable |
| 15334-1 | WOODLAKE SANITARY SERVICES, INC. FLYING CLOUD SANITARY LANDFILL | Favorable |
| 15354-1 | NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY - FIFTH STREET SUBSTATION | Qualified Favorable |
| 15355-1 | MINNEAPOLIS ENERGY CENTER, INC. & ENERGY CENTER PARTNERS MINNEAPOLIS ENERGY CENTER - NORTH RIVERFRONT PLANT | Qualified Favorable |
| 15356-1 | ST. PAUL RAMSEY MEDICAL CENTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Qualified Favorable |
| 15363-1 | MINNESOTA FACILITIES WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES | Favorable |
| 15369-1 | HONEYWELL, INC. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15380-1 | VALVOLINE INSTANT OIL CHANGE RAPID OIL CHANGE | Favorable |
| 15381-1 | WHITTAKER CORP. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15384-1 | TOWLE REAL ESTATE CO. WCCO BUILDING | Favorable |
| 15385-1 | UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA CME BUILDING | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 15386-1 | BCED MINNESOTA, INC. TOWN SQUARE | Favorable |
| 15393-1 | MWCC WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15394-1 | MWCC WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15395-1 | SUPER VALUE STORES, INC. MINNEAPOLIS NORTH ANNEX | Favorable |
| 15396-1 | CONTROL DATA CORPORATION CONTROL DATA CORPORATION - OFFICE | Favorable |
| 15397-1 | VICTORY ENVELOPE, INC. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15398-1 | RIDGEDALE CENTER WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15410-1 | MOBIL OIL CORP. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15411-1 | QUALITY PARK PRODUCTS WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15412-1 | HINES INTERESTS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP NORWEST CENTER | Favorable |
| 15414-1 | WASHINGTON COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH WASHINGTON COUNTY LANDFILL #1 | Qualified Favorable |
| 15415-1 | 3M 3M CHEMOLITE | Favorable |
| 15416-1 | SHIELY, J. L. CO. SHAKOPEE QUARRY AREA | Favorable |
| 15417-1 | AMOCO OIL CO. RICHFIELD AMOCO | Favorable |
| 15418-1 | GENERAL MILLS, INC. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15419-1 | SHIELY, J. L. CO. LARSON QUARRY AREA | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 15420-1 | ROGERS WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15422-1 | PAPER, CALMENSON & CO. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15423-1 | MWCC MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15426-1 | KOHLER MIX SPECIALTIES WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Qualified Favorable |
| 15430-1 | INDEPENDENCE MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15436-1 | TPI /CMS ST. PAUL LIMITED PARTNERSHIP NORWEST CENTER | In Process Dec 31 |
| 15439-1 | TOWLE REAL ESTATE WCCO RADIO BUILDING | Favorable |
| 15483-1 | ANDERSEN CORPORATION WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15512-1 | LIFECORE BIOMEDICAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15538-1 | NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. VARIOUS HYDROSTATIC TEST SITES IN MINNESOTA | Favorable |
| 15539-1 | ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15562-1 | MINNESOTA BREWING CO. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15580-1 | INTEK WEATHERSEAL PRODUCTS, INC. WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15587-1 | H F S PROPERTIES HEMAR BUILDING | Favorable |
| 15594-1 | AMOCO OIL COMPANY AMOCO S.S. #5016 | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|---------------------|
| 15399-1 | GREENFIELD MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY | Favorable |
| 15445-1 | SHIELY, J. L. CO. DREDGE SPOIL DISPOSAL FACILITY | Qualified Favorable |
| 15463-1 | KOCH REFINING CO. DREDGE SPOIL DISPOSAL FACILITY - OTTO AVE. TERMINAL | Favorable |
| 15464-1 | NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. DREDGE SPOIL DISPOSAL FACILITY, RIVERSIDE GENERATING PLANT | Favorable |
| 15465-1 | NORTHERN STATES POWER CO. DREDGE SPOIL DISPOSAL FACILITY, BLACK DOG GENERATING PLANT | Favorable |
| 15466-1 | KOCH REFINING CO. DREDGE SPOIL DISPOSAL FACILITY | Favorable |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals

F. Special Permits

2. Corps of Army Engineer Permits

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 15321-1 | WOLTER, KEVIN FILL MATERIAL, WETLANDS ADJACENT TROTT BROOK, CONSTRUCT GOLF COURSE | Unfavorable |
| 15326-1 | MINNETONKA FILL MATERIAL, PUBLIC TRAIL, PURGATORY PARK | Favorable |
| 15330-1 | ANOKA COUNTY PARKS FILL MATERIAL, RICE CREEK WETLANDS, 1.75 ACRES-CHOMINIX GOLF COURSE | Unfavorable |
| 15342-1 | MCGOWAN, RICHARD B. COMPANY, INC. FILL MATERIAL, ACCESS TO FREEWAY LANDFILL SITE FROM EMBASSY ROAD | Favorable |
| 15358-1 | ZAWISTOWSKI, STAN FILL MATERIAL ADJACENT TO COON CREEK, NIGHTINGALE MEADOWS | Favorable |
| 15371-1 | BROOKLYN CENTER FILL MATERIAL INTO WETLANDS, 69TH AVENUE REALIGNMENT PROJECT | Unfavorable |
| 15373-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES CONSTRUCT PUBLIC ACCESS BOAT RAMPS | Favorable |
| 15383-1 | STILLWATER CONSTRUCT STORM SEWER OUTFALL STRUCTURE & INTAKE PIPE | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|---------------------|
| 15424-1 | ST. PAUL WETLAND FILL & WORK IN NAVIGABLE WATERS - SHEPHERD ROAD | Favorable |
| 15428-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISCHARGE FILL, EXTEND FRONTAGE ROAD S. SIDE OF TH 101 | Unfavorable |
| 15429-1 | HENNEPIN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCT BRIDGE OVER MINNESOTA RIVER CROSSING | Favorable |
| 15432-1 | STILLWATER PLACE UP TO 8 NO-WAKE BUOYS IN ST. CROIX RIVER | Favorable |
| 15451-1 | RAMSEY COUNTY PLACE FILL, LEXINGTON AVE. BETWEEN ROYAL OAKS DRIVE N. TO CR J | Unfavorable |
| 15467-1 | ABC SOD FARM GRADE & EXCAVATE MATERIAL - CHANGE PRODUCT AREA FROM GRASS TO TREES | Favorable |
| 15473-1 | HIGH FIVE ERECTORS, INC. DISCHARGE FILL MATERIAL, COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT | Unfavorable |
| 15487-1 | BLAINE FILL MATERIAL - REALIGNMENT XYLITE ST. BETWEEN 95TH ST. & 101ST AVE. NE | Unfavorable |
| 15495-1 | CARVER COUNTY DISCHARGE FILL MATERIAL, BEVENS CREEK - DITCH 11 | Unfavorable |
| 15496-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISCHARGE FILL MATERIAL-GATEWAY SEGMENT OF WILLARD MUNGER STATE TRAIL | Favorable |
| 15519-1 | MINNETONKA PLACE FILL IN WETLAND - PUBLIC TRAIL | Favorable |
| 15520-1 | RAMSEY / ANOKA COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS PLACE FILL MATERIAL INTO RICE CREEK - COUNTY ROAD J | Favorable |
| 15540-1 | PETERSON, DARRIL PLACE FILL MATERIAL, GARDEN CENTER/NURSERY | Unfavorable |
| 15570-1 | MENNE, ROBERT J. DISCHARGE FILL MATERIAL, CONSTRUCT ROAD TO NORTH SHORE MEADOWS | Qualified Favorable |
| 15574-1 | ST. PAUL PLACE FILL, WARNER ROAD BETWEEN JACKSON STREET & CHILDS ROAD | Qualified Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|---|---------------------|
| 15581-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FILL MATERIAL, TWO BOAT RAMPS AT LAKE REBECCA PARK | Favorable |
| 15582-1 | REHBEIN, GLENN EXCAVATING FILL & GRADE WITHIN WETLANDS, DEVELOP GOLF COURSE | Favorable |
| 15583-1 | RAMSEY COUNTY FILL MATERIAL, REALIGN CR I FROM HAMLINE AVE. TO LEXINGTON AVE. | Favorable |
| 15586-1 | MINN. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISCHARGE FILL MATERIAL, RELOCATE TECHNOLOGY DRIVE | Qualified Favorable |
| 15588-1 | HENNEPIN COUNTY PARK RESERVE DISTRICT PLACE FILL IN WATERS - SAND BLANKET IN MEDICINE LAKE | Favorable |
| 15600-1 | WEGLEITNER, MARTIN DISCHARGE FILL MATERIAL, RICE LAKE MEADOWS SUBDIVISION | In Process Dec 31 |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals

G. Regional Park Master Plan

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 09228-2 | MINNEAPOLIS PARK & RECREATION BOARD AMENDMENT TO NOKOMIS/HIAWATHA RP | In Process Dec 31 |
| 09285-1 | MINNEAPOLIS PARK & RECREATION BOARD SHINGLE _CREEK TRAIL | In Process Dec 31 |
| 09217-2 | ST. PAUL LILYDALE/HARRIET ISLAND REGIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN | In Process Dec 31 |

V. Miscellaneous Referrals

H. Housing Bond Plans and Programs

| <u>Referral Number</u> | <u>Applicant/Description</u> | <u>Council Action</u> |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 15313-1 | ROBBINSDALE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, 84 UNITS, 40TH AVE. N. AND CR 81 | Favorable |
| 15322-1 | SCOTT COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15323-1 | CARVER COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, 114 UNITS MULTIFAMILY, 110340 GRAKE ROAD | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|-----------|
| 15324-1 | CARVER COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15336-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, MULTIFAMILY SENIOR HOUSING | Favorable |
| 15337-1 | DAKOTA COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING | Favorable |
| 15337-2 | DAKOTA COUNTY HRA AMENDED HOUSING BOND PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15343-1 | BLOOMINGTON HOUSING BOND PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15344-1 | WEST ST. PAUL HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING | Favorable |
| 15348-1 | LAKEVILLE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15353-1 | APPLE VALLEY HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15366-1 | MINNEAPOLIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, RIVERTOWN APARTMENTS PROJECT, 36 UNITS | Favorable |
| 15367-1 | MINNEAPOLIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, GIRARD TERRACE PROJECT, 17 UNITS | Favorable |
| 15368-1 | ST. PAUL PARK HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15372-1 | WASHINGTON COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15374-1 | OAKDALE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15382-1 | WASHINGTON COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SINGLE FAMILY | Favorable |
| 15409-1 | CARVER COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15421-1 | COTTAGE GROVE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, COTTAGES OF COTTAGE GROVE | Favorable |

| | | |
|---------|--|---------------------|
| 15461-1 | SPRING PARK HOUSING BOND PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15462-1 | MINNEAPOLIS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, WALKER RESIDENCE PROJECT | Qualified Favorable |
| 15485-1 | WASHINGTON COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15510-1 | ST. PAUL HOUSING BOND PROGRAM - EPISCOPAL CHURCH HOME OF MINNESOTA PROJECT | Favorable |
| 15534-1 | EDEN PRAIRIE HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, MULTIFAMILY HOUSING | Favorable |
| 15551-1 | ARDEN HILLS HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, SUTTON PLACE | Favorable |
| 15555-1 | ST. PAUL HOUSING BOND PROGRAM | Favorable |
| 15592-1 | MAPLEWOOD HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, COTTAGES OF MAPLEWOOD WEST PROJECT | Favorable |
| 15599-1 | WASHINGTON COUNTY HRA HOUSING BOND PROGRAM, COTTAGE HOMESTEADS | Favorable |

