

Report of the Site Consultant

for the

# VETERANS' HOME SITING STUDY

1 February 1989

Laws 1988, Chapter 689 Article 1

 DERISE ATIVE REFERENCE LIFERANT 5450 State Office Building Solar Phys. Minnesora 55159

Prepared for: MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Divisions of: Management Analysis and Building Construction

Prepared by: Klein McCarthy & Co., Ltd., Architects and Gair & Associates Site Design and Planning Consultants

APR 3 1989

Second Fro

Minnesota Library Access Center

R465

1989

Consultant's Report prepared for the Administration Department

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|      |  | Page        |
|------|--|-------------|
| Α.   | INTRODUCTION   | 1           |
|      | • Legislative Direction  |             |
| Β.   | PROCESS  | 1           |
|      | <ul> <li>Request for Information</li> <li>Location Eligibility</li> <li>Program Requirements</li> <li>Project Requirements</li> </ul>  |             |
|      | 1. Evaluation Criteria   | 1           |
|      | - Mandatory<br>- Desired   | 2<br>2      |
|      | 2. RFI Response  | 2           |
|      | 3. Evaluation Method   | 2           |
|      | <ul> <li>Submittal Requirements</li> <li>Mandatory Criteria</li> <li>Desired Criteria         <ul> <li>Apparent Suitability</li> <li>Intrinsic Characteristics</li> <li>Compatibility</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | 2<br>2<br>2 |
|      | 4. Site Categorization   | 3           |
|      | 5. Conclusion  | 4           |
| Арре | endix I - Request for Information  | I-1 - 12    |
|      | Veterans' Home Siting Study -<br>Follow-up to October 14, 1988   |             |
| Appe | endix II - Mandatory & Desired Criteria Rationale  | II-1 - 4    |
| Appe | ndix III - Evaluation Chart of Mandatory & Desired Criteria,<br>Sites and Buildings  | III-1 - 4   |

# Appendix IV - Summary of Site Evaluation

| Arlington     | IV-1  |
|---------------|-------|
| Canby         | IV-3  |
| Fairfax       | IV-4  |
| Fairmont      | IV-5  |
| Fergus Falls  | IV-7  |
| Granite Falls | IV-9  |
| Jasper        | IV-11 |
| Luverne       | IV-12 |
| Madison       | IV-13 |
| Madison Lake  | IV-15 |
| Mankato       | IV-17 |
| Marshall      | 1V-19 |
| Montevideo    | IV-21 |
| New Ulm       | IV-23 |
| Redwood Falls | IV-25 |
| St. Peter     | IV-27 |
| Slayton       | IV-29 |
| Tracy         | IV-31 |
| Tyler         | IV-32 |
| Waseca        | IV-33 |
| Willmar       | IV-35 |
| Windom        | IV-37 |
| Worthington   | IV-38 |
|               |       |

#### A. INTRODUCTION

The 1988 Minnesota Legislature directed the completion of a study of the feasibility of the following projects:

- (1) Establishment of a facility in Fergus Falls for the housing and nursing care of veterans; and
- (2) Establishment of a veterans' home in southwestern Minnesota. (Laws 1988, Ch. 689, Art. 1.)

The Minnesota Department of Administration has been directed to study the feasibility of establishing a veterans' home in these areas. The department has contracted with site consultants for evaluation of proposed sites and/or buildings.

Klein McCarthy & Company, Ltd., Architects, and Gair & Associates, Site Designer and Planning Consultants have assisted the department in the following manner:

- 1. Formulated appropriate evaluation criteria
- 2. Participated in October 14, 1988 informational meeting in Redwood Falls.
- 3. Responded to inquiries from prospective proposers.
- 4. Reviewed proposer responses for completeness.
- 5. Evaluated the physical and related features of each candidate site and established its relative feasibility as a Veterans' Home site.
- 6. Prepared a report with findings and conclusions for incorporation in the Complete Feasibility Study prepared by the Minnesota Department of Administration.

#### B. PROCESS

A Request For Information (RFI) was prepared. The RFI was distributed on October 14, 1988 at an informational meeting conducted in the Redwood Falls, Minnesota armory. Approximately 145 persons were in attendance. A copy of the Request For Information is attached as Appendix I.

The Request For Information sought to identify properties in southwestern Minnesota and Fergus Falls which may be considered and evaluated as candidates for establishment of a veterans' home. Properties which were to be considered included existing buildings which could be altered, improved or expanded to meet the relevant criteria and appropriate vacant sites.

The Request For Information stated <u>Program Requirements</u>, including location eligibility, type and size of facility, limitation on cost of any acquired facility, ownership, lease facilities and shared cost participation. Site and/ or building <u>location eligibility</u> extended to the city limits of Fergus Falls and an area specified as southwestern Minnesota and defined as Minnesota Development Regions 6W, 6E, 8 and 9. These development regions include 27 counties.

Project Requirements were set forth in the Request For Information which represent guidelines for the site-specific or building-specific candidates. Features of proposed properties that meet the <u>mandatory and desired criteria</u> were itemized and documented in each of the proposals in response to the Request for Information.

1. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation of each site's feasibility for the future potential siting of a veterans' home and nursing care facility was conducted vis-a-vis pre-established mandatory and desired criteria listed in the Request For Information. Initial review determined that all mandatory and submittal requirements were met by the respondents with one exception.

<u>Mandatory criteria</u> were defined as criteria which must be met for a property to be considered in the study. <u>Desired criteria</u> were defined as additional positive features which should be met by a site candidate to be given further consideration. Appendix II provides further insight into the significance and intent of each of the listed criteria.

2. RFI Response

By 4:30 p.m. on November 18, 1988, the Department of Administration had received responses from 23 communities to the October 14, 1988 Request For Information. The communities proposed a total of 39 different sites. The formality of evaluating each of the candidate sites was then undertaken.

3. Evaluation Method

The method of evaluation consisted of three review items. The following items are intended to <u>cumulatively substantiate</u> an individual <u>site's credibility</u> for further serious consideration as a location for a veterans' housing facility.

It should be noted that the Management Analysis Division has evaluated the following four items (the site evaluation consultants did not consider these items):

- Proximity to Veterans Administration hospital/medical center.
- Proximity to established medical/dental/acute care services and facilities.
- Availability of trained personnel to assure adequate staffing; proximity to state university, community college or vocational-technical school with appropriate programs.
- Land contribution and other financial considerations listed in the Program Requirements of the RFI.

Each response was reviewed for its compliance to the Request for Information:

- a. The RFI listed 24 <u>submittal requirements</u>, all of which were required for a building and site candidate. 16 of the required submittal items were appropriate for vacant land candidates.
- b. Compliance with each of the <u>mandatory criteria</u> or evidence that equivalent information had been provided.
- c. Its effort to address the <u>desired criteria</u>, including the items listed in the RFI which relate overall to:
  - Its apparent suitability and/or adaptability for possible future use as a veterans' housing and nursing care facility.
  - Tangible qualities and/or intrinsic character conducive for the siting of a veterans' housing and nursing care facility.
  - Compatibility with existing and future land uses and environs.

With one exception, all respondents provided required information for the above first two items. Appendix III is comprised of charts which summarize the review of the required submission items and mandatory and/or desired criteria.

Although establishment of a veterans' home and funding rests with the Legislature, the purpose of the site evaluation study was to provide direction by identifying candidate sites which apparently demonstrate high cumulative positive environmental and intrinsic attributes to the siting of a veterans' housing and nursing care facility. Site visits were not needed. In most instances the completeness of the RFI provided sufficient information to complete a site evaluation and render an opinion. In a few situations, a phone conversation was used to acquire, clarify or illustrate an aspect of an individual response.

Considerations were also given to the sites' intrinsic suitability. Intrinsic suitability can be defined in terms of a site and its environ's ability to accommodate and compliment a prospective use. The intrinsic suitability of a site is a composite impression derived from all the information available to the evaluators regarding the sites' features as recorded by the responses to the RFI. Objective or quantitative factors provide a direction, but must be buttressed by professional experience and opinion. Additionally, intrinsic suitability implies that the use of a parcel of real estate for a specific use will add to the value of the site by embellishing or enhancing its physical features and by enhancing its human usability or functionality.

In the instance of a veterans' housing and nursing care facility, a site's intrinsic suitability is maximized through design visualization; i.e., hypothetically siting a veterans' facility on a particular site within a specific urban/rural context with observable physical site amenities and community support facilities which are complimentary, compatible and conducive to the use.

4. Site Categorization

For the purpose of this study, the candidate sites were ultimately grouped into categories of <u>Excellent</u>, <u>Good</u> and <u>Adequate</u>. Categorization definitions are:

Excellent: Overall exceptional candidate site. Good: Overall an average site candidate. Adequate: Meets minimum requirements.

Categorization was accomplished by individual and group evaluation.

Appendix IV (Summary of Site Evaluation) is a more detailed summary of the evaluators' review and elaboration of the data provided for each site. Submission requirements and mandatory and desired criteria have been accounted for and summarized in Appendix III. Contained within the following pages are added comments, reviews and findings in support of the proposed categorization of each of the sites.

Each site is reviewed within a standard format:

- Identification
- Findings
- Conclusions
- Categorization

The order of presentation is alphabetic.

5. Conclusion

From the field of 39 candidate sites, 10 sites were considered Excellent, 12 sites Good, 16 sites Adequate and one was dropped from consideration.

None of the 38 sites is inadequate and the facts are that they are competitive with each other and differ only by comparison with regard to the factors described above.

The conclusions of this study are a component of the complete Feasibility Study being prepared by the Minnesota Department of Administration. Integration of this study with other components will provide a basis for formulating recommendations to be considered by the Legislature.

# TABULATION OF SITE CATEGORIZATION

| CITY          | SITE                 |           | CATEGORIES |             |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
|               |                      | Excellent | Good       | Adequate    |
| Arlington     | #1<br>#2<br>#3<br>#4 |           | X          | X<br>X<br>X |
| Canby         |                      | X         |            |             |
| Fairfax       |                      |           |            | Х           |
| Fairmont      | A<br>B               | Х         | x          |             |
| Fergus Falls  |                      | Х         |            |             |
| Granite Falls |                      |           | Х          |             |
| Luverne       | A<br>B               | X<br>X    |            |             |
| Madison       |                      |           |            | Х           |
| Madison Lake  | 1<br>2<br>3          |           | X<br>X     | X           |
| Mankato       |                      |           |            | Х           |
| Marshall      | A<br>B               | x         |            | Х           |
| Montevideo    |                      |           | Х          |             |
| New Ulm       |                      |           |            | Х           |
| Redwood Falls |                      |           |            | Х           |
| St. Peter     |                      | Х         |            |             |
| Slayton       |                      |           |            | X           |
| Tracy         |                      |           | Х          |             |
| Tyler         |                      |           |            | Х           |

| <u>CITY</u> | SITE                            |           | CATEGORIES         |                  |
|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------|
|             |                                 | Excellent | Good               | Adequate         |
| Waseca      | 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7 | X         | X<br>X             | X<br>X<br>X<br>X |
| Willmar     | A<br>B<br>C                     | Х         | X<br>X             |                  |
| Windom      |                                 |           | Х                  |                  |
| Worthington |                                 | Х         |                    |                  |
| Jasper      |                                 | W         | as Not Categorized |                  |
|             |                                 |           |                    |                  |
| TOTAL       | 39                              | 10        | 12                 | 16               |

# **APPENDIX I**

ſ

#### STATE OF MINNESOTA



# **APPENDIX I**

Department of Administration

MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS DIVISION October 14, 1988

# **VETERANS HOME SITING STUDY - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

To whom it may concern:

The Minnesota Department of Administration has been directed by the Legislature to study the feasibility of establishing veterans homes in southwestern Minnesota and Fergus Falls. The study is being conducted by the department's divisions of Management Analysis and Building Construction. The department has contracted with site consultants for evaluation of proposed sites and/or buildings.

Information gathered through this Request for Information is intended to enable the site consultant and the department to evaluate and compare proposals. On-site investigation will be undertaken for sites and/or buildings which warrant further evaluation. Due to financial limitations it is expected that a limited number of sites will be selected for on-site work.

The results from consultant evaluations will be joined with information developed by the Management Analysis Division for presentation to the Legislature in a report due February 1, 1989.

Please refer your questions to the contact persons listed on the next page if you need further information concerning the submission of your proposal.

Sincerely yours, Terry Bock Director

203 Administration Building 50 Sherburne Avenue Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155 (612) 296-6887

# **REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

## Critical Information Summary

- PURPOSE This Request for Information (RFI) is intended to provide proposers a framework to describe precisely and completely their proposal for the use of a specific property (site and/or building) as a state veterans home in southwestern Minnesota or Fergus Falls.
- GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION Only properties in southwestern Minnesota or Fergus Falls are eligible for consideration. Southwestern Minnesota is defined as Minnesota Development Regions 6W, 6E, 8 and 9.
- ELIGIBLE Properties which may be proposed include sites and/or buildings. PROPERTIES Eligible buildings include those which can be expanded, remodeled or altered to meet the relevant criteria.
- DEADLINE To be considered, the completed response to the RFI including all submittals in the correct number of copies must be <u>received</u> at the address of the Department of Administration noted below by <u>4:30</u> <u>p.m., November 18, 1988</u>.
- NUMBER OF COPIES Submittals must be provided by the proposer. All items submitted become the property of the State of Minnesota and will not be returned.
- CONTACTS <u>Completed responses to RFIs should be returned to</u>:

Veterans Home Siting Study Department of Administration Room 203 Administration Building 50 Sherburne Avenue St. Paul, MN 55155

Questions concerning the RFI should be addressed to the site consultant:

George Klein Klein, McCarthy & Co., Ltd., Architects 18300 Minnetonka Boulevard Deephaven, MN 55391 612/473-1505

<u>Additional copies of the RFI</u> can be requested from the Department of Administration at the above address or by calling 612/296-6887.

- CLARIFICATION If it becomes necessary to clarify or modify the RFI or other issues NOTICE related to consideration of properties, a notice will be sent to persons and organizations who have provided the department with a mailing address for that purpose.
- LEGISLATIVE Legislative action is required to create and fund a state veterans ACTION home. No assurance can be given that any of the properties evaluated in this study will be chosen for such a facility, or that such a facility will be built.

Proposals must be substantially complete according to the RFI submittal requirements to ensure that the site consultant and the department can correctly evaluate and compare proposals.

# **PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

LOCATION ELIGIBILITY. Sites and/or buildings must be located in Fergus Falls or southwestern Minnesota. Southwestern Minnesota is defined as Minnesota Development Regions 6W, 6E, 8 and 9. This area includes 27 counties: Big Stone, Blue Earth, Brown, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Faribault, Jackson, Kandiyohi, Lac Qui Parle, Le Sueur, Lincoln, Lyon, McLeod, Martin, Meeker, Murray, Nicollet, Nobles, Pipestone, Redwood, Renville, Rock, Sibley, Swift, Waseca, Watonwan, and Yellow Medicine.

TYPE OF FACILITY. Proposals for existing buildings and/or sites are to be for a nursing home care facility.

SIZE OF FACILITY. The required number of beds has not yet been determined. Proposals should provide for facilities in the range of a *minimum of approximately 30* beds to a maximum of 120 beds. A sample space configuration for a 60-bed unit is provided in the appendix as a point of reference.

LIMITATION ON COST OF AN ACQUIRED FACILITY. Proposers should be aware, but do not need to demonstrate in the proposal, that the total cost of acquisition of a proposed facility, including any expansion, remodeling and alteration to meet all building requirements and codes, and for all other purposes, must not exceed the estimated cost of construction of an equivalent new state home facility.

*OWNERSHIP.* The proposal must anticipate that the facility will be owned by the State of Minnesota, unless a lease arrangement is proposed. (See "Leased facility" below.) If an existing building is proposed which requires expansion, remodeling or alteration, it is anticipated that the state would acquire ownership of the property prior to the start of such work and accomplish the work through normal appropriation procedures. Proposals should clearly describe any proposed departure from this ownership arrangement.

LEASED FACILITY. The Veterans Administration has indicated it may grant state home recognition to a facility under contract with or leased by the state. As is the case for any state veterans home, the facility must meet the definitional requirements in Title 38 of the U.S. Code; and it must be "separate and distinct" from other institutions. However, to receive a grant from the Veterans Administration to construct, expand, remodel or alter a state veterans home, the state is required to give reasonable assurance that it has title to the site of the project. Thus, under 38 U.S.C. Sections 5031-5037, a facility under contract with or leased by the state would not be eligible to receive a state veterans home grant if the state does not have title to the site.

COST PARTICIPATION. Proposals should clearly describe any planned local contributions to the project, such as in-kind contributions, construction funding, land, building, utility subsidies, or others.

## **PROJECT REOUIREMENTS**

Project requirements represent guidelines for the site-specific or building-specific information in proposals. Features of proposed properties that meet the mandatory and desired criteria should be itemized and documented as part of the proposer's response to the RFI. Additional positive features of the property or the proposal, beyond those listed as criteria, should be itemized and documented.

# **<u>NOTE</u>**: Proposals for buildings should respond to both the site candidate criteria and the building candidate criteria, but need not repeat information.

# DEFINITIONS.

<u>Mandatory criteria</u> must be met for a property to be considered in the study. A strong presumption exists that each such criterion as stated must be met. If the criterion is not met, the proposer must demonstrate that it is proposing something that is the equivalent, or is better, functionally and otherwise, to the item specified.

<u>Desired criteria</u> are additional positive features of the property. A property should meet many of the desired criteria to further its consideration.

# SITE CANDIDATES CRITERIA.

## Mandatory criteria:

- 1. Adequate size: approximately three to five acres per module (one module = 60 bed unit); minimum buildable area of two acres per module.
- 2. Adequate soil bearing capacity: minimum 1500 pounds per square foot.
- 3. Positive site drainage.
- 4. Direct frontage on a paved thoroughfare.
- 5. Public utilities and municipal services including sewer, water, gas, electric, telephone, fire, law enforcement, ambulance/ paramedic, etc.
- 6. Free of environmental hazards such as flood, insect breeding, noise and air pollution, ground water and soil contamination, and historic/archaeological constraints such as native American burial grounds.
- 7. Conformance to zoning and land use codes.

#### Desired criteria:

- 1. Proximity to Veterans Administration hospital/medical center.
- 2. Proximity to established medical/dental/acute care services and facilities.
- 3. Availability of trained personnel to assure adequate staffing; proximity to state university, community college or vocational-technical school with appropriate programs.
- 4. Proximity to community activity centers such as parks, churches and synogogues, retail and entertainment centers, educational centers and libraries, and others.
- 5. Availability of public transportation for residents, staff and visitors.
- 6. Desirable site characteristics such as water, slopes, woodland, flora/fauna.
- 7. Prominence, visibility, orientation appropriate to the use.
- 8. Other site features or additional considerations.

# BUILDING CANDIDATES CRITERIA.

# Mandatory criteria:

- 1. Upon occupancy as a state veterans home, a minimum useful life of forty (40) years.
- 2. Upon occupancy as a state veterans home, current code conformance with respect to fire resistance, earthquake proof structure, energy, fire and life safety, handicapped barrier free, environmental systems, utilities, etc.
- 3. Ability to accommodate or adjust to the "space requirements guidelines" in the appendix.

# Desired criteria:

- 1. Single story structure.
- 2. Ease of maintenance.
- 3. Proven economy of operation.
- 4. Additional building amenities, features or additional considerations.

# SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

- A. <u>Cover page</u>. The cover page should name the proposal very briefly, and provide the name, mailing address and telephone number of: (1) the sponsor of the proposal, (2) a person to contact for further information.
- B. <u>Executive summary</u>. The executive summary should describe the site and/or building and summarize key features and strengths of the proposal. Preferred length is one typewritten page; maximum length is two typewritten pages.
- C. <u>Structured narrative</u>. The structured narrative should describe the site and/or building in detail and demonstrate how the property meets the program and project requirements outlined above. The narrative should follow the structure of the program and project requirements. Please respond to each requirement individually, in the order they are listed above.
- D. <u>Site information/attachments</u>. (Proposers of buildings should include both site and building information/attachments. Information provided in the site information section need not be repeated in responding to the building information section.)
  - 1. Legal property description. Site size including total acreage and buildable acreage.
  - 2. Ownership information, including name, address and telephone number.
  - 3. Section map locating property boundaries and identifying adjacent land uses within 300 feet in all directions.
  - 4. Site diagram locating any existing buildings or structures.
  - 5. Identification of easements and restrictive covenants.
  - 6. Appraised property value with date of appraisal. A copy of the most recent appraisal is desirable.

- 7. USGS or better topographical map.
- 8. Soil report, for example, test report of borings, Soil Conservation Service maps, county soils agent information.
- 9. Zoning maps and land use guide. Affidavit of conformance of proposed use with zoning ordinances and/or land use guide.
- 10. Utility and street maps.
- 11. Aerial photos.
- 12. Ground level photos of pertinent site features.
- 13. Acquisition cost to the state. Information concerning availability of the site, including timeframe and any constraints. Proposal as to how the state would acquire ownership, or lease arrangements. Extent of any local participation in funding or contribution.

E. <u>Building information/attachments</u>. (Proposers of buildings should include both site and building information/attachments. Information provided in the site information section need not be repeated in responding to the building information section.)

- 1. Description of basic building features including current use, age, type of structural frame, mechanical/electrical systems, interior and exterior finish.
- 2. Site plan to scale, showing building location and pertinent site features such as access, drives, walks, parking, etc.
- 3. "As built" floor plans at minimum of 1/16" scale.
- 4. Recent photographs of each side of the building. Also provide elevation drawings and other "working drawings" if available.
- 5. Schematic drawings showing the proposed building modifications to meet requirements, including mandatory criteria.
- 6. Description of the locations and extent of any hazardous materials such as asbestos, PCBs, and others. Description of containment policy and practices.
- 7. Construction outline which describes basic building materials and systems, and proposed work required to expand, remodel or alter the building to meet all building requirements, codes, regulations and standards.
- 8. Cost estimates for the total cost of the property to the state, including any expansion, remodeling and alteration to meet all building requirements and codes, and any other applicable costs. Information concerning availability of the building, including timeframe and any constraints. Description of any local participation in funding or contribution. Information concerning availability of the building, including timeframe and any constraints. Proposal as to how the state would acquire ownership, or lease arrangements.

#### <u>APPENDIX</u>

<u>Evaluative criteria</u>. Proposals will be evaluated by the site consultant and the department based primarily upon the extent to which they meet the program and project requirements and upon related factors specified in the legislation directing the study. The codes, rules, regulations and policies of government agencies having jurisdiction over or interest in such facilities, such as those referenced below in this appendix, provide additional criteria. Not all the requirements in the codes, rules, regulations and policies of these agencies are appropriate at this stage of consideration of properties, but proposers should be aware of their existence.

<u>Enabling legislation for the study</u>. Laws 1988, Chapter 689, Article 1, directs the commissioner of administration "to complete by February 1, 1989, (1) an operational cost analysis, (2) an impact analysis on other nursing homes in the area, (3) a demographic study of the number of veterans that would be served in the area, (4) staffing level requirements and the availability of staff, and (5) a site feasibility study for the following projects: (a) establishment of a facility in Fergus Falls for the housing and nursing care of veterans; and (b) establishment of a veterans home in southwestern Minnesota."

<u>Codes and regulations</u>. The following codes and regulations comprise a partial listing of sources of information relevant to a proposal for a state veterans home facility: State Building Code; Title 38, U.S.C., Section 5031, et seq.; Code of Federal Regulations, Title 38, Ch. 1, Section 17.165, et seq., and sections referenced therein ; IB 18-1, Standard Procedures and General Conditions for State Home Grant Projects; OMB Cir. A-102; Uniform Fire Code; Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards; the laws, regulations, rules and policies of the Department of Health. All other codes and regulations, including those governing construction in the community where the proposed property is located, or having to do with state and/or federal institutions of this type, are considered applicable to the proposal.

<u>Space requirements guidelines</u>. The chart on page 699 of 38 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) Ch. 1 (7-1-87 edition) lists the Veterans Administration space criteria for nursing home care units (net square feet allowable per 50 bed unit). The following list of spaces was prepared from the chart by the site consultant for this study. The list suggests basic space guidelines for a possible configuration of a 60 bed nursing home care facility. Numbers in parentheses beside descriptions indicate quantity of the item.

Support facilities space:

| Administrator's office            | 200.  |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Asst. Administrator               | 150.  |
| Medical officer, Dir. of Nursing  | 150.  |
| General administration            | 150.  |
| Clerical staff (2)                | 160.  |
| Conference room/consultation area | 500.  |
| Lobby/waiting area                | 180.  |
| Public toilets, M/F               | 90.   |
| Pharmacy                          | 120.  |
| Dietetic service office           | 120.  |
| Dining area                       | 1200. |

| Kitchen/dishwashing/storage<br>Resident toilets, M/F<br>Resident lounge with storage<br>Resident quiet room<br>Clean utility<br>Soiled utility<br>Linen storage<br>General storage<br>Nurse station ward sec and med room<br>Exam/treatment room<br>Waiting area<br>Vending<br>Unit supply and equipment<br>Staff toilet<br>Stretcher/wheelchair storage<br>Kitchenette<br>Housekeeping closet<br>Resident laundry<br>Multi-purpose room<br>Physical activities<br>Physical activities<br>Physical activities<br>Physical activities<br>Physical activities<br>Physical activities<br>Physical activities<br>Dictary and medical storage<br>Resident storage<br>General storage<br>General storage<br>Janitors closets (4)<br>General laundry<br>Service platform/dock | $\begin{array}{c} 1600, \\ 90, \\ 480, \\ 180, \\ 145, \\ 125, \\ 180, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 170, \\ 60, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 145, \\ 50, \\ 150, \\ 1200, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120, \\ 120, \\ 300, \\ 120$ |
|--|---|
| Subtotal support facilities Net Sq.Ft.   | 13095.  |
| Efficiency factor (1.5x) Gross Sq.Ft.  | <u>19643</u> .  |
| Housing facilities space:  |   |
| Rooms 1-bedroom, wheelchair access (4)<br>Rooms 2-bedroom, wheelchair access (28)<br>Private toilet facility for 1,  | 600.<br>5600.   |
| wheelchair accessible (4)<br>Shared toilet facility for 4,   | 200.  |
| wheelchair accessible (14)<br>Central bath/shower facility (2)   | 700.<br>400.  |
| Subtotal housing facilities Net Sq.Ft.   | 7500.   |
| Efficiency factor (1.7x) Gross Sq.Ft.  | <u>12750</u> .  |
| Total facilities summary: Gross Sq.Ft.   | <u>32393</u> .  |

October 20, 1988

# VETERANS HOME SITING STUDY - FOLLOW-UP TO OCTOBER 14, 1988, MEETING

# To Meeting Attendees:

Thank you for your interest in the State Veterans Home Siting Study for Southwest Minnesota and Fergus Falls and your attendance at the October 14 meeting in Redwood Falls. Enclosed is a list of persons who attended the meeting.

This letter responds to the questions and requests for additional information from persons at the meeting. The following information should be used and understood in the context of the Request for Information (RFI) and the presentations made at the meeting.

# What case mix might be expected for a new state veterans home?

We expect the case mix for new state veterans homes in Southwest Minnesota and Fergus Falls to approximate the average case mix score for nursing homes statewide in Fiscal Year 1987: 2.39.

# Would Veterans Administration funding be available for a leased facility?

The Veterans Administration contributes per diem payments and grants to assist in funding state veterans homes. To be eligible to receive <u>per diem payments</u>, a state veterans home must be given "state home recognition" by the Veterans Administration. This recognition requirement can be met by a facility under contract with or leased by a state. To be eligible to receive a <u>grant</u> for the construction, expansion, remodeling or alteration of a state veterans home, a state must give reasonable assurance that it has title to the site of the project. A facility under contract with or leased by a state would <u>not</u> be eligible to receive a state home grant unless the state has title to the site.

# How long could a lease term be?

The maximum lease term for state leases of land or premises is five (5) years (Minn. Stat. 16B.24, subd. 6).

# Where can copies of the codes and regulations be obtained?

The federal documents referenced in the RFI appendix generally relate to the Veterans Administration. They include sections of the U.S. Code and the Code of Federal Regulations, and other federal government publications. These documents should be available at federal depository libraries including Southwest State University in Marshall (507/537-6134), some county law libraries, the Milwaukee U.S. Government Bookstore, Rm. 190 Federal Building, 517 E. Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53202 (414/291-1304), the U.S. Government Printing Office in Washington, D.C., and the Veterans Administration, 810 Vermont Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20420 (202/233-2741). The State Building Code, Uniform Fire Code, regulations of the Department of Health, and other state documents are available from the Documents Division, 117 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55155 (612/297-3000). Local offices such as city clerk, city engineer, planning and economic development offices, and/or libraries may also have copies.

Zoning, land use and other local codes should be available at the offices of city clerks, city engineers, local planning and economic development offices, and/or libraries.

# Are building drawings required for proposals of a site only?

Drawings are not required if the proposal is for a site only. A site diagram which includes the "footprint" or location of a building is appropriate.

# Would proximity to a local hospital or other medical services be a substitute for proximity to a Veterans Administration Medical Center (VAMC)?

The Veterans Administration regulations regarding payment for services at non-VA facilities appear in 38 C.F.R. sections 17.50, et seq., and 17.80, et seq. The circumstances are limited; therefore proximity to local hospital services cannot be considered a substitute for proximity to a VAMC.

Please call our office at 612/296-6887 if we can provide additional information about the study. Please call Klein, McCarthy & Associates, Ltd., at 612/473-1505 for specific questions concerning submittal requirements in the Request for Information.

## DOES YOUR COMMUNITY PLAN TO PROPOSE A SITE AND/OR BUILDING FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE STUDY?

### If the answer is "yes", please call us at 612/296-6887 to let us know. Thank you.

#### MINNESOTA VETERANS HOME SITING STUDY MEETING AT REDWOOD FALLS OCTOBER 14, 1988

#### List of Attendees

Don Abild, Windom Bob Anderson, Ottertail Gordon E. Anderson, Ortonville John Baldridge, Sioux Falls Keith Baldwin, Redwood Falls Herb Baumhoefner, Trimont Ron Beebout, Redwood Falls Judy Beech, Sleepy Eye Frederic H. Berreau, Woodstock Alice M. Bjerrum, Slayton Terry Bliven, Luverne Jack Bloedel, New Ulm Dean Bloemke, Redwood Falls Bob Borath, Olivia Pete Brand, Windom Earl J. Brust, Worthington Douglas F. Bunkers, Madison Jill Callison, Worthington Loren R. Carlson, Heron Lake Norman R. DeBlieck, Milroy Gary DeCramer, Ghent Tim Dornbusch, Madison Kelly Ferber, Fergus Falls Mark Fischenrich, Marshall Lyle R. Foltz, St. Paul Karl Frantz, Renville Dave Fredrickson, Murdock Jerry Geske, Jasper Edgar H. Gillond, Minneota Gordon P. Gits, Luverne Robert Grams, Storden Erwin Grere, Redwood Falls Jerry Groebner, Madison Lake Day Hacke, Jackson Ronald H. Hansen, Luverne Vince Hanson, Sacred Heart C. LaVerne Hartman, Worthington Charlotte Heitkamp, Adrian Pete Helquist, Eagle Lake

Earl F. Henderson, St. James H. Eugene Hippe, Willmar Jim Hokanson, Edina Charlie Hopkins, Fulda Harry Hornbrook, Sleepy Eye James A. Hubly, Marshall Gordon A. Hydukovich, Fergus Falls L.K. "Pete" Iverson, Redwood Falls George E. Jellener, Worthington Ron Jensen, Marshall Ernest D. Johnson, Redwood Falls Larry Juhl, New London Norman Kalk, Morgan T. Delberg Kettner, Morgan Paul Knoblauch, Amiret Richard E. Koeneke, Worthington Myron D. Koets, Pipestone Woody Kramer, Vesta Christopher Kuffel, Redwood Falls Ed Lamberg, Worthington Frank Lawatsch, Blue Earth Bruce L. Lease, Worthington Bob Lindquist, Worthington Harold Lueth, Fairmont Thomas F. MacAulay, New Ulm Mark Machart, Redwood Falls Perry Martinson, Fairmont Dianne McPherson, North Mankato J. William Merritt, Minneota Delbert Miller, Edina Mick Myers, Pipestone Richard L. Nelson, Worthington Harlan Nepp, Pipestone Raymond R. Nielsen, Tyler Jim Nitchals, Fergus Falls Katy Olson, Sherburn Jerry Opoien, Granite Falls Clarence Paxton, Marshall Marcia Pelzel, Fairfax

Susan Pemberton, Wells Steve Perkins, Luverne John E. Peterson, Pipestone Susan M. Pirsig, Slayton Melvin J. Platt, Worthington Jim Plocher, Sacred Heart Dale Potter, Springfield Wesley Pruett, Fairmont Ronald Purcell, Waseca Jack Quinlivan, Wells Thomas Reber, Fairmont Paul G. Rehkamp, Marshall Earl Rennecke, LeSueur Steven Renguist, St. Peter Con Rettmer, Tracy John Rickers, Springfield Jerome T. Schjahstad, Redwood Falls Eugene Schmitz, New Ulm Steve Schou, Gaylord Randy Schultz, Sleepy Eye Walter Siegman, New Ulm Gerald Stokke, St. Paul Rich Stoutenberg, Fairmont Willis "Bill" Teeter, Fairmont Ardis Teeter, Fairmont Art Thielgas, Tracy Ernest Thooft, Russell Clifford A. Thoreson, Olivia D. William Tiffant, Redwood Falls Chester L. Toso, Fergus Falls Dick Tracy, Mountain Lake Loren L. Urban, Fairmont Gloria Vande Brake, Windom Ben Vander Koor Jr., Luverne Jim Vickerman, Tracy Roland Wray, Heron Lake Ev Wright, St. James Jim Wychor, Worthington Francis J. Zuffer, Milroy

# APPENDIX II

# **APPENDIX II**

## VETS' HOME SITING STUDY CRITERIA RATIONALE:

#### A. SITE CANDIDATES CRITERIA: <u>Mandatory:</u>

1. Adequate Size: approximately three to five acres per module (one module = 60 bed unit); minimum buildable area of two acres per module.

The estimated gross area of a Veterans' Home containing one housing module (60 beds) is approximately 32,400 square feet, 75% of one acre and roughly 25% of three acres. A building coverage ratio of 25% is a very acceptable industry standard. A minimum requirement to provide adequate parking space for residents, visitors and staff including some overlap at shift change will be for about 110 cars which is equal to one acre. Green space surrounding the building to provide for adequate setbacks and utility easements will consume about 1/2 acre - Thus:

| Building Footprint | 3/4 A        |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Parking            | 1 A          |
| Greenspace         | 1/2 A        |
| Drives and Walks   | <u>3/4 A</u> |
| TOTAL              | 3 A          |

- 2. Adequate soil bearing capacity: minimum 1500 pounds per square foot. This capacity is considered adequate for most single story construction where the structural load brought down to a 20" wide footing will not exceed 2505 pounds per running foot. Any soil rated at less than 1500 pounds per square foot which is to support construction may need to be replaced by a stabilized fill which could meet the 1500 pounds per square feet minimum.
- 3. Positive site drainage.

To preclude the possibility of damage to the site and potential building, enough information needs to be given in the proposer's submittal that would demonstrate the drainage pathways and any alterations to the existing site that would be required to assure positive drainage of storm water off the site.

4. Direct frontage on a paved thoroughfare.

This requirement is to assure all-weather access to the site from a roadway which is a part of an established state, county or municipal system. It does not preclude a site which would either accommodate or benefit from a long driveway or access road, but it would preclude sites from consideration that are not situated on a paved thoroughfare.

5. Public utilities and municipal services including sewer, water, gas, electric, telephone, fire, law enforcement, ambulance/paramedic, etc.

These utilities and services must be available at the time of site procurement (or be pledged as a condition of the selection process). With regard to fire, law enforcement, ambulance and/or paramedic services, it is intended that these capabilities will provide a level of public safety in keeping with the needs of a veteran's nursing home care facility.

## VETS' HOME SITING STUDY CRITERIA RATIONALE:

6. Free of environmental hazards such as flood, insect breeding, noise and air pollution, ground water and soil contamination, and historic/archaeological constraints such as native American burial grounds.

The site must be free of environmental hazards and/or archaeological features. It is conceivable that if a candidate site were of sufficient size to accommodate the Veterans' Home and required support facilities and still have land such as wetlands or floodplain, these areas may be considered within that context of aesthetic open space or wildlife amenities. Certainly some of the listed physical environmental features are a positive attribute providing all other buildable site needs are met. It is not, however, acceptable to have a situation with insurmountable physical constraints.

7. Conformance to land use codes.

Zoning and land use regulation conformance is required to avoid unnecessary problems and contentiousness. Land use plan amendments, re-zoning and variances are timely and costly processes. A candidate site must be zoned to accommodate the Veterans' Home as a permitted use or as a conditional use at a minimum and only when the responsible local governmental unit can guarantee the Veterans' Home acceptability.

#### <u>Desired:</u>

- 1. Proximity to Veterans Administration hospital/medical center. \* The prime deliverer of medical services to the veterans housed in a nursing home care facility is intended to be a Veterans Administration Medical Center (VAMC). Therefore proximity becomes a budgetary factor in the operation of a Vets Nursing Home Care Facility.
- 2. Proximity to established medical/dental/acute care services and facilities. \* The original intent for listing this as a desired criteria was that in the absence of any Veterans Administration hospital or medical center, other public or private medical/dental care facilities and services should be available.
- 3. Availability of trained personnel to assure adequate staffing; proximity to state university, community college or vocational-technical school with appropriate programs. \* The presence of a public or private educational institution which could promote the flow of candidates for staff positions at the Veterans' Home will be considered in the evaluation of sites. Positions ranging from R.N.s and health care aides to kitchen, laundry, clerical & custodial duties will be open from time to time.
- 4. Proximity to community activity centers such as parks, churches and synagogues, retail and entertainment centers, educational centers and libraries, and other. Each site will be evaluated with respect to the nature and proximity of activity centers in the community of the proposer. A variety of support facilities such as a shopping center, library, movie theater, park, educational center, etc. will provide services and diversionary activities to the veteran and his family.
- \* NOTE: These criteria will be evaluated by the Managemert Analysis Division.

- 5. Availability of Public transportation for residents, staff and visitors. Accessibility for staff and residents to a transit or shuttle system will greatly increase the mobility of persons who reside in or visit the facility with regularity.
- 6. Desirable site characteristics such as water, slopes, woodland, flora/fauna.
  - A variety of physical site characteristics such as water, slopes, woodland, flora and fauna add to the esthetic and natural interest and value of the site. This is in contrast to an intensely developed urbanized site with no opportunity for residents to commune with nature. However, prudence in this regard is necessary to evaluate what might be considered appropriate and meaningful site characteristics to an ultimate development plan.
- 7. Prominence, visibility, orientation appropriate to the use. Prominence, visibility and site orientation are included as a device to raise one's level of consciousness in selecting a candidate site for a Veterans' Home. It is intended that the proposers of a site would be cognizant of the appropriateness and desirability for a site to possess a prominent elevation (a knob or knoll) with views and vistas and with a solar orientation which are conducive to healing, tranquility and peace. The consideration of these more philosophical aspects of the site feasibility study are an attempt to focus and design within the significance of the veteran.
- 8. Other site features or additional considerations. Such additional features which, if present, may be considered as enhancements or unique conditions which contribute to the desirability of a particular site.

### B. BUILDING CANDIDATES CRITERIA: <u>Mandatory:</u>

1. Upon occupancy as a state Veterans' Home, a minimum useful life of forty (40) years.

In order to assure a sound investment, a candidate building must be of such quality of construction and finish that its functional life will at least be equal to the time required to amortize its purchase and improvement. This amount of time is typically considered in the industry to be 30 - 40 years.

2. Upon occupancy as a state Veterans' Home, current code conformance with respect to fire resistance, earthquake-proof structure, energy, fire and life safety, handicapped barrier free, environmental systems, utilities, etc. As in item 1 above, the classification and quality of construction must be of such caliber that either as the candidate building exists or as it is possible to renovate it, the current applicable codes can be met prior to placing the facility in operation. Such codes are broadly varied and may require such exhaustive retrofit or renovation as to result in construction which will cause the costs thereof to approach and even exceed the probable cost of a new facility. 3. Ability to accommodate or adjust to the "space requirements guidelines" in the appendix.

The support facilities spaces are listed as net areas in the appendix of the RFI (pp. 6,7). The list was prepared by the consultant based on a merging of information from the 7-1-87 edition of Title 38 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) pertaining to the Nursing Home Care (NHC) program and information from the State of Minnesota Department of Health, chapters 4665, Supervised Living Facilities (1985 edition), and 4655/4660 (1987 edition). To be considered, a candidate building must be shown to be able to accommodate the functions and sizes of spaces therein portrayed with a building addition, if required.

#### <u>Desired:</u>

1. Single-story structure.

Staffing ratios are high in this type of facility (e.g. 1.2 staff/resident). One nursing station is provided for each 60 beds. When floors are stacked and occupancy of each is under 60, duplications of space and supervisory personnel are unavoidable. Ideally, nursing modules should be in clusters of rooms with dayroom cores and with connecting corridors which are free of barriers to the handicapped. Bedrooms on more than one floor will result in costly vertical movement (elevators) and duplication of supervisory locations.

#### 2. Ease of maintenance.

Building candidates will be evaluated with respect to maintainability of basic materials and systems found in the existing building. It will also be considered the extent to which such materials or systems may require upgrading or replacement.

#### 3. Proven economy of operations.

To verify operational experience of candidate building systems, records or statements describing the same will be examined by the consultant as a part of the review process.

#### 4. Additional building amenities, features or other considerations.

Any other of such features thought by the proposing community to have values worth pointing out about a building candidate should be noted.

# APPENDIX III

| E        | EVALUATION CRITERIA  |  |  | PROPOSED   | SITES   |   | E   | valuation Chart A                         | PPENDIX III-1  |
|----------|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
|          | SITING   | #1   | #2   | #3   | #4  | #5  | #6  | #7  | #8   |
| <u> </u> | Mandatory  | ARLINGTON  | CANBY  | FAIRFAX  | FAIRMONT  | FERGUS FALLS  | GRANITE FALLS   | JASPER                                    | LUVERNE  |
|          | 1. ADEQUATE SIZE<br>3-5 ACRES PER MODULE                                     |  | 1 SITE<br>4 ACRES  | 5 ACRES  | b- 17 ACRES   | 1 SITE<br>9.4 ACRES   | l site<br>10.5 acres  | 4.5 ACRES/27.679 S.F.                     | 2 sites<br>a- 12.6 acres<br>b- 12.91 acres                         |
|          | 2. ADEQUATE SOIL BEARING CAPACITY<br>MIN. 1500#/SQ. FT.                      | NO TESTS.<br>CLAIMED TO BE<br>ADEQUATE           | COUNTY SOIL SURVEY<br>SHOWS 1500# OR<br>MORE                 | C'NTY AGENT CLAIMED                                  |   | FOOTINGS: 1500-3000#<br>SOME ENGR'D FILL<br>FOR SLABS ON GRADE  | 1500#   |   | CLAIMED TO BE<br>MORE THAN 1500#                                   |
|          | 3. POSITIVE SITE DRAINAGE  | 1  | SITE DRAINS TO THE   | CLAIMED TO BE  | A- VERY GOOD<br>B- IMPROVABLE                                     |   | 1% SLOPE <del>T</del> O THE<br>SOUTH                          |   | STATED TO BE<br>EXCELLENT DRAINAGE                                 |
|          | 4. DIRECT FRONTAGE ON A PAVED<br>THOROUGHFARE                                | SITES 1 AND 2<br>REQUIRE PAVING<br>IMPROVEMENTS  | ADJOINS ST. CLIFF<br>AVENUE                                  | HIGHWAY #4   | 4   | PARK STREET ON EAST<br>TO BE ENTRY/EXIT                         | OAK STREET AND<br>COUNTY ROAD 38 TO<br>THOROUGHFARE 23        |   | u.s. highway 75 and<br>c.s.a.h. <b>18</b>                          |
|          | 5. PUBLIC UTILITIES AND MUNICIPAL<br>SERVICES AVAILABLE                      | WATER, SEWER,<br>ELECTRICAL AND GAS<br>AVAILABLE | ALL CITY UTILITIES<br>ARE AVIALABLE                          |  | A- CLOSE BY<br>B- ALL AVAILABLE                                   | AVAILABLE STEAM IN<br>TUNNEL EXTENSION<br>FROM RTC              | AVAILABLE ON THE<br>SITE                                      | BY MUNICIPAL                              | AVAILABLE AT THE<br>PROPERTY LINES OF<br>BOTH SITES                |
|          | 6. FREEDOM FROM HAZARDS AND<br>CONSTRAINTS                                   | ALL SITES ARE FREE<br>OF HAZARDS                 | SITE IS FREE OF<br>HAZARDS                                   | NO KNOWN HAZARDS<br>OR CONSTRAINTS                   | BOTH SITES FREE OF<br>HAZARDS. NEITHER IN<br>FLOOD PLAIN          | SITE IS FREE OF<br>KNOWN HAZARDS                                | SITE IS FREE OF<br>KNOWN HAZARDS                              | SITE APPEARS TO BE<br>FREE FROM HAZARDS   | ALL SITES FREE OF<br>KNOWN OR SUSPECTED<br>HAZARDS                 |
| -        | USE CODES  | SITES 1 AND 2<br>REQUIRE ZONING<br>CHANGES       | CONFORMS; PARK<br>ADJACENT; CEMETERY<br>S.E.MAYBE IN VIEW    | REQUIRE REZONING<br>FOR ANNEXATION                   | A- RURAL, PASTORAL<br>B- SUBURBAN, MED.<br>PARK                   | SPECIAL USE PERMIT<br>REQUIRED FOR<br>CONDITIONAL USE           | SPECIAL USE PERMIT<br>REQUIRED FOR<br>I-ZONE                  | SPECIAL USE PERMIT<br>LIKELY              | ANNEXATION<br>ORDINANCE REQUIRED                                   |
|          | . Desired  |  |  |  |   |   |   |   |  |
| *        | MEDICAL CENTER   | MINNEAPOLIS VAMC<br>HOSPITAL IS 60<br>MILES      | CENTRAL LOCATION<br>125 MILES TO VAMC<br>FARGO AND ST. CLOUD | DISTANCE TO BOTH<br>MSP & STC VAMC<br>IS 90 MILES    | SIOUX FALLS VAMC IS<br>120 miles. mpls<br>VAMC is 130 miles       | FARGO VAMC IS 60<br>MILES DISTANT                               | SIOUX FALLS AND<br>MPLS/ST, PAUL ARE<br>120 MILES             | SIOUX FALLS SOUTH<br>Dakota is 40 minutes | sioux falls is<br>30 minutes via<br>1-90                           |
| *        | 2. PROXIMITY TO ALTERNATE<br>MEDICAL/DENTAL SERVICES                         | LOCAL HOSPITAL                                   | LOCAL HOSPITAL   | 15 MILES TO<br>SLEEPYEYE HOSPITAL                    |   | SEVERAL WITHIN 2-25<br>MILES                                    |   | DOCTOR AND DENTIST                        | 38 BED COMMUNITY<br>HOSPITAL AND<br>MEDICAL CLINIC                 |
| *        |  |  | S.W. TECHNICAL<br>INSTITUTE<br>30 MILES TO SWSU              | WITHIN 3 COUNTY<br>AREAS BROWN,<br>RENVILLE & SIBLEY | MANY TRAINING PROG.<br>AVAILABLE AT NEARBY<br>COLL. & TECH. INST. | AVTIS/MSU, CONCORDIA  | AVAILABLE AT S.W.<br>TECH. INST. PLUS<br>SKILLED COMM. FORCES | STAFFING:"NO<br>PROBLEM"                  | AVAILABLE FROM S.W.<br>TECH. INST., S.W.S.U.<br>& WORTHINGTON C.C. |
|          | 4. PROXIMITY TO COMMUNITY ACTIVITY<br>AND SUPPORT FUNCTIONS                  | WITHIN 1 MILE                                    | 5 BLOCKS   | 9 BLOCKS TO<br>CBD                                   | A- REMOTE<br>B- SHORT WALK  | WITHIN ONE CITY<br>BLOCK  | CBD LESS THAN 2<br>MILES TO THE WEST                          | 5 BLOCKS                                  | 1.5 MILES TO MAJOR<br>CBD FUNCTIONS                                |
|          | FOR RESIDENTS STAFF & VISITORS   | AIR, ROAD;<br>NO PUBLIC<br>TRANSPORTAION         | NOT ADDRESSED  | COUNTY VAN   | PUBLIC<br>TRANSPORTATION WITH<br>WHEELCHAIR LIFT                  | MINI BUS FOR SENIORS<br>\$250,000 TRUST FOR<br>TRANSPORTATION   | "DIAL-A-RIDE" CITY<br>BUS ON 1 JANUARY<br>1989                | COUNTY VAN FOR<br>HANDICAPPED             | COUNTY VAN PLUS<br>CHURCH & VOLUNTEER<br>SERVICES                  |
|          | 6. DESIRABLE SITE CHARACTERISTICS  | #1 HAS ATTRACTIVE                                | LOCATED IN A PARK<br>ON A LAKE                               | AGRICULTURAL<br>LAND                                 | A- LAKE<br>B- BETWEEN HOSPITAL<br>AND CHURCH                      | ADJACENT TO A PARK,<br>ON SITE TREES AND                        | DEDICATED PARK 16A<br>CONTIGUOUS TO BE<br>DEVELOPED           | NONE WERE NOTED                           | PARK, PRAIRIE<br>RIVER TERRACE SLOPE<br>2.5% SITE A 1/4 MILE       |
|          | 7. PROMINENCE, VISIBILITY,<br>ORIENTATION                                    | ALL SITES VISIBLE<br>FROM HIGHWAY                | VISIBLE FROM<br>RESIDENTIAL AREAS                            | COULD BLEND WITH<br>EXISTING NURSING<br>HOME         | BOTH SITES IDEALLY<br>SUITED                                      | VISIBLE FROM ADJACENT<br>RESIDENTIAL AREAS IN<br>CAMPUS SETTING | VISTAS TO   | NONE WERE NOTED<br>D                      | NORTH EAST TO<br>HORIZON. DISTANT<br>VIEWS                         |
| *        | 8. OTHER POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES<br>THESE CRITERIA WERE EVALUATED BY THE MANAGEM | ENT ANALYSIS DIVISION                            |  |  |   |   |   |   |  |
|          | II. Submittal Checklist<br>SUBSTANTIALLY IN CONFORMANCE<br>(SEE RFI P. 4-5)  | X  | X  | X  | Х   | X   | X   | NO  | X  |

| EVALUATION CRITERIA                                   | <br>I                  |                      | PROPOSED S                        | SITES               |                                      |                                |                                       | III-2                            |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| SITING  | #9                     | #10                  | #11                               | #12                 | #13                                  | #14                            | #15                                   | #16                              |
| I. Mandatory  | MADISON                | MADISON LAKE         | MANKATO                           | MARSHALL            | MONTEVIDEO                           | NEW ULM                        | RED WOOD FALLS                        | SAINT PETER                      |
| 1. ADEQUATE SIZE                                      |                        | 3 SITES              | 1 SITE                            | 2 SITES             | 1 SITE                               | 1 SITE                         |                                       | 1 SITE                           |
| 3-5 ACRES PER MODULE                                  | 12.25 ACRES IN CITY    | 1- 6 ACRES; 2- 5     | 9.9 ACRES                         | A- 7.37 ACRES       | 5.5 ACRES                            |                                | JACKES                                | 14 ACRES                         |
|   | 1]                     | ACRES: 3- 3 ACRES    |                                   | B- 4.8 ACRES        | ·/                                   |                                | 54000 SQITTI DED                      | STATE OWNED                      |
| <ul> <li>2. ADEQUATE SOIL BEARING CAPACITY</li> </ul> | STATED 1500#           | TTOOL YOOOUED HEED 1 | 1                                 |                     | REQUIRES GRANULAR                    | ADJACENT SOIL STATED           |                                       | TEST REPORT ATTESTS              |
| MIN. 1500#/SQ. FT.                                    | 1                      | FUNITIEN TESTS TITON | 1                                 | B- 1500# ASSUMED    |                                      |                                | ON SOLID FOUNDATION                   | TO 1500# CAPACITY                |
| р<br>р  | 1                      | HAILS TABLE          | VERIFY                            | ·!                  |                                      | BEARING CAPACITY               | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                                  |
| 3. POSITIVE SITE DRAINAGE                             |                        | STORE SERVER         |                                   |                     |                                      | EXISTING STEEP SITE            |                                       | STORM SEWER AND                  |
|   | <b>u</b> 1             | PROPOSED TO SERVE    | 1                                 |                     | AND EAST                             | SLOPES TO CITY<br>HOLDING POND |                                       | NATURAL SLOPE WILL<br>DRAIN SITE |
| 1   | 1                      |                      | S. SIDES<br>BALCERZAK DRIVE       | ALL DIRECTIONS      |                                      |                                |                                       | FRONTAGE ROAD                    |
| 4. DIRECT FRONTAGE ON A PAVED                         | 1                      |                      |                                   | i                   |                                      | ADD 8TH STREET N.              | AND IN                                | CONNECTS TO US 169               |
| THOROUGHFARE  | R 1                    | DOCK EARE ROLD       | ON NORTH SIDE                     |                     |                                      |                                | USE FOR EXISTING                      |                                  |
|   | TO STATE HIGHWAY 40    |                      | AVAILABLE AT                      | A- AVAILABLE        |                                      |                                |                                       | CITY SEWER & ELEC.               |
| 5. PUBLIC UTILITIES AND MUNICIPAL                     | AVAILABLE              | ATTENDED IN OTTE     |                                   | 1 1                 |                                      |                                |                                       | AVAILABLE. STEAM &               |
| SERVICES AVAILABLE                                    | 1                      | 1                    |                                   |                     |                                      |                                |                                       | WATER FROM RTC.                  |
|   | <b></b>                |                      |                                   | BOTH SITES FREE OF  |                                      | SITE FREE OF KNOWN             |                                       | SITE FREE OF KNOWN               |
| 6. FREEDOM FROM HAZARDS AND                           |                        |                      | STIE THEE OF MICHIN               | KNOWN HAZARDS       |                                      |                                | 1                                     | HAZARDS                          |
| CONSTRAINTS   | PARTICULARLY           | ADEQUATE             | HAZARDS                           |                     | hazando j                            | HALANDO ,                      |                                       | HALARDS                          |
| 7. CONFORMANCE TO ZONING AND LAND                     | SUITABLE               | SPECIAL USE PERMIT   | CONFORMANCE TO LAND               | A- CEMETERY TO N.   | ANNEXATION INTO                      | CONFORMANCE TO                 | EXISTING BUILDING                     | EXISTING R-3 ZONE                |
| USE CODES   |                        | REQUIRED             |                                   |                     |                                      | 7                              |                                       | PERMITS A VA STATE               |
|   | REQUIRED               |                      | ORDINANCE                         | REQUIRED            | PLANNED                              | 1                              |                                       | HOME                             |
| II. Desired   | 1                      |                      | I                                 | 1                   |                                      |                                |                                       |                                  |
| <ul> <li>I. PROXIMITY TO VETERANS ADMIN.</li> </ul>   | SIOUX FALLS VAMC       | 75 MILES TO MPLS     | MINNEA OLIO MINO                  | MPLS VAMC 150 MILES | 1 1                                  |                                |                                       | 65 MILES TO VAMC                 |
| MEDICAL CENTER  | 120 MILES              |                      | IS 80 MILES                       | MANKATO 75 MILES    | 1 1                                  | TO MPLS OR ST. CLOUD           | JD _ AND SIOUX                        | MINNEAPOLIS                      |
|   |                        |                      |                                   | !'                  |                                      |                                | FALLS S.D. VAMC                       |                                  |
| 2. PROXIMITY TO ALTERNATE                             | 21 BED COMMUNITY       |                      | Z/Z BLD HOOT THE                  | WMMC HOSPITAL IN    | CLINIC AND HOSPITAL                  |                                |                                       | RTC ADJACENT                     |
| MEDICAL/DENTAL SERVICES                               | HOSPITAL IS            | MANKATO HOSPITAL     | IS LARGEST IN                     | MARSHALL            | ON ADJACENT LAND                     | HOSPITAL NEXT DOOR             | HOSPITAL 43 BED                       | ALSO MANKATO 272 BED             |
|   | ADJACENT               |                      | S.W. MINNESOTA                    | ·'                  | ·'                                   | 1                              |                                       | HOSPITAL                         |
| ✤ 3. AVAILABILITY OF STAFF                            | CANBY COMMUNITY COLL   |                      | MANKATO STATE                     | S.W.S.U; WILLMAR    | WILLMAR COMM. COLL.                  |                                | S.W.S.U.                              | GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS                |
| EDUCATION/TRAINING                                    | GRANITE FALLS AND      | UNIVERSITY           |                                   | COMMUNITY COLL .;   |                                      | MKTO TECH 27 MILES             |                                       | COLL. M.S.U. 15 MI.              |
| ·   | WILLMAR AVTI           | 1                    | 1                                 | S.D.S.U.            | TEN DI OCIVO TO                      |                                | WILLMAR COMM. COLL.                   | RECREATIONAL, EDUC.              |
| 4. PROXIMITY TO COMMUNITY ACTIVITY                    | 7 BLOCKS TO CBD        | WALKING DISTANCE     | 1.5 MILES TO                      | 6 BLOCKS TO SHOPPG  | FEW BLOCKS TO<br>SHOPPING CENTER AND | 10 BLOCKS TO CBD               | NEAR FAIR GROUNDS                     | AND CULTURAL COMMER-             |
| AND SUPPORT FUNCTIONS                                 | 1                      | 1                    | MAJOR SHOPPING                    | CENTER, TO BLOCKS   |                                      | COMMUNITY FUNCTIONS            |                                       | CIAL IN WALKING DIST.            |
| ,   | 1'                     | 1                    |                                   | TO CBD              |                                      | MEDICAL TRANSPORT              |                                       |                                  |
| 5. AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORTATION                     | MINI BUS               | UNDETERMINED         | "DIAL-A-RIDE" AND<br>MASS TRANSIT | AIR, BUS, TAXI      | And only Doo                         |                                | INTER CITY BUS                        | VAN, CAB AND INTER               |
| FOR RESIDENTS STAFF & VISITORS                        | (LUTHERAN HOME)        | 1                    | MASS TRANST                       | 1                   |                                      |                                | OTHER INFO NOT FOUND                  |                                  |
|   | WOODLAND ADJACENT      | LAKE, WETLAND AND    | CLAIMED TO BE FREE                | A-(NOT APPIICABLE)  |                                      |                                | S OPEN SPACE TO N & E                 |                                  |
| 6. DESIRABLE SITE CHARACTERISTICS                     | WOUDLAND ADJACENT      | PARKS                | OF NATURAL AMENITIES              |                     | AFFORDS FASY ACCES                   | WUUDS, SCENIC VIENS            | ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOR                  | RIVER WILDLIFE                   |
| ,   |                        | FANNS                | 01 100                            | B- NEAR PARK        |                                      | 1                              | HOOD                                  |                                  |
| 7. PROMINENCE, VISIBILITY,                            | FORMER USE WAS AS      | EXPANSION VIEWS TO   | HIGH VISIBLITY FROM               |                     |                                      |                                | THIS SITE IS OFF THE                  | HE VIEWS OF RIVER AND            |
| ORIENTATION   | TRAILER PARK           | THE SOUTH            |                                   | FROM SITE B         |                                      |                                | REGULARLY TRAVELED                    | WOODS                            |
|   |                        |                      | 11,000 VEHICLES/DAY               |                     | COMPLEX                              |                                | STREETS                               |                                  |
| 8. OTHER POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES                          |                        | FISHING DOCK AND     |                                   |                     |                                      |                                |                                       |                                  |
| * THESE CRITERIA WERE EVALUATED BY THE MANAGEM        | MENT ANALYSIS DIVISION | BEACH                |                                   | 1                   |                                      |                                |                                       |                                  |
|   |                        |                      |                                   |                     |                                      |                                |                                       |                                  |
| III. Submittal Checklist                              |                        |                      |                                   |                     |                                      |                                |                                       |                                  |
| SUBSTANTIALLY IN CONFORMANCE                          |                        | 1                    |                                   |                     |                                      | v                              | •                                     | x                                |
| (SEE RFI P. 4-5)                                      | Х                      | X                    | X                                 | Х                   | X                                    | X                              | X                                     | ^ ^                              |
| 4   | 1                      |                      |                                   | .[                  |                                      |                                |                                       |                                  |

| EVALUATION CRITERIA  |   | 1  | PROPOSED  | SITES  |   |                          |   | III-3 |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|-------|
| SITING   | #17   | #18  | #19   | #20  | #21   | #22                      | #23   |       |
| I. Mandatory   | SLAYTON   | TRACY  | TYLER   | WASECA   | WILLMAR   | WINDOM                   | WORTHINGTON   |       |
| 1. ADEQUATE SIZE<br>3-5 ACRES PER MODULE   | 1 SITE  | 10 ACRES   | 1 SITE  | 7 SITES  | 1   |                          | 1 SITE<br>9.4 - 11.4 ACRES  |       |
| 2. ADEQUATE SOIL BEARING CAPACITY<br>MIN. 1500#/SQ. FT.  | IN EXCESS OF 1500#  | NEARBY SOIL TESTS  | ATTESTED TO BY TCT<br>TO 1500#                                  |  | ALL SITES<br>ADEQUATE                                       |                          | TEST REPORT SHOWS<br>1500# AT LEAST                                   |       |
| 3. POSITIVE SITE DRAINAGE  |   |  | 1   | ALL SITE CENTRED   | ALL SITES ADEQUATELY<br>DRAINED                             |                          | SITE GRADING<br>REQUIRED TO DIRECT<br>DRAINAGE                        |       |
| 4. DIRECT FRONTAGE ON A PAVED<br>THOROUGHFARE  |   | EAST   | 1   |  | ESTABLISHED STREETS   | DRIVEWAY TO 71           | STREET TO BE EXTENDED<br>3 ACCESS ROADS<br>AVAILABLE                  |       |
| 5. PUBLIC UTILITIES AND MUNICIPAL<br>SERVICES AVAILABLE  |   | BY THE CITY  |   | TO BE PROVIDED FOR   | SOME EXTENSTIONS<br>NEEDED                                  |                          | AVAILABLE FROM CITY   |       |
| 6. FREEDOM FROM HAZARDS AND<br>CONSTRAINTS   | SITE SIZE WILL LIMIT<br>THE BUILDING PLACE-<br>MENT OPTIONS |  |   | KNOWN HAZARDS ON<br>ANY SITE                                   | HAZARDS   | HAZARDS AND<br>POLLUTION | GOOD PLANNING WILL<br>ASSURE PROPER<br>DRAINAGE                       |       |
| 7. CONFORMANCE TO ZONING AND LAND<br>USE CODES   | ZONING IS FAVORABLE   | R-2 MULTIPLE SAME<br>AS HOSPITAL AND<br>NURSING HOME         | ZONED OKAY  | REZONE TO R-3  | ALL SITES CONFORM<br>TO ZONING<br>REQUIREMENTS              | CONDITIONAL USE          | COMPATIBLE-NEEDS<br>HEARINGS FOR<br>REZONING                          |       |
| II. Desired  |   |  |   |  | //  | · '                      |   |       |
| <ul> <li>PROXIMITY TO VETERANS ADMIN.</li> <li>MEDICAL CENTER</li> </ul>                               | 75 MILES TO VAMC<br>SIOUX FALLS S.D.                        | 90 MILES TO VAMC<br>SIOUX FALLS S.D.                         |   | SITE #1 90 MILES TO<br>VAMC MINNEAPOLIS                        | 60 MI TO STC VMAC   |                          | SIOUX FALLS S.D.  |       |
| <ul> <li>PROXIMITY TO ALTERNATE<br/>MEDICAL/DENTAL SERVICES</li> </ul>                                 | MURRAY COUNTY<br>HOSPITAL                                   | HOSPITAL ADJACENT<br>(MUNICIPAL)                             | CLINIC ADJACENT   | 1 MILE TO WASECA<br>HOSPITAL FROM<br>SITE #1                   |   |                          | 99 BED HOSPITAL 1.5<br>MILES DISTANT                                  |       |
| <ul> <li>AVAILABILITY OF STAFF</li> <li>EDUCATION/TRAINING</li> </ul>                                  |   | SS.D.S.U. IS 60 MILES<br>WORTHINGTON COMM.CO.<br>IS 50 MILES | . OF LABOR AND OF   | U OF M TECHNICAL<br>WASECA BRANCH U/M<br>GMSU,AUSTIN COMM. CO. | AND TECH. INSTITUTE   | COMM. COLL.              | WORTHINGTON COMM. CO.<br>IOWA TECH. COLL. AND<br>S.W. VO. TECH. INST. |       |
| 4. PROXIMITY TO COMMUNITY ACTIVITY<br>AND SUPPORT FUNCTIONS  | PARKS AND RETAIL<br>ARE PROXIMAL                            | 7 BLOCKS TO CBD  | 6 BLOCKS TO<br>COMMUNITY ACTIVITY                               | COMMUNITY FUNCTIONS  | S ESTABLISHED<br>COMMUNITY NEARBY                           | SUPPORT NEARBY           | PROXIMAL TO COLLEGE<br>CAMPUS   |       |
| 5. AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORTATION<br>FOR RESIDENTS STAFF & VISITORS                                    | CONTRACT SERVICE<br>NO PUBLIC SERVICE                       | VOLUNTEER<br>NO PUBLIC TRANSIT                               | \$7.00/ROUND TRIP<br>TO VAMC SIOUX FALLS<br>ALSO VOLUNTEER VANS |  | PUBLIC TRANBUT<br>TAXI AND WHEELCHAIR<br>VANS               | BY COUNTY PLUS           | TAXI W/COUPONS, BUS<br>AIR/VOLUNTEERS CCST<br>VANS FOR HANDICAPPED    |       |
| 6. DESIRABLE SITE CHARACTERISTICS  | SIZE LIMITS<br>EXPANSION                                    | OPEN SPACES TO<br>NORTH AND EAST                             |   | WOODS AND LAKE<br>VIEWS FROM SITE #1                           | LAKE VIEWS FROM   | INSTITUTIONAL<br>SETTING | LAKE OKABENA ACCESS<br>AND VIEWS                                      |       |
| 7. PROMINENCE, VISIBILITY,<br>ORIENTATION  | VIEWS TO THE EAST   | FLAT FARMLAND  | VISIBILITY  | SCENIC, SERENE<br>SETTING OF ALL<br>SITES                      | VERY STRONG VISIBLE,<br>PROMINENT ESPECIALLY<br>FROM SITE B | I C REELER TROVIDED      | PROMINENT   |       |
| <ul> <li>8. OTHER POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES</li> <li>THESE CRITERIA WERE EVALUATED BY THE MANAGER</li> </ul> | "GRAND SUNRISE"<br>EVENT ANALYSIS DIVISION                  |  |   | LAKE ACCESS FROM<br>SITE #1                                    | WIDE OPEN SPACES<br>GOLF COURSE                             |                          |   |       |
| III. Submittal Checklist<br>SUBSTANTIALLY IN CONFORMANCE<br>(SEE RFI P. 4-5)                           | X   | X  | Х   | X  | X   | X                        | X   | Χ     |

| EVALUATION CRITERIA                                | BU  | ILDINGS  | -4 |
|--|---|--|----|
| BUILDING   | JASPER  | REDWOOD FALLS  | Ī  |
| I. Mandatory                                       | ELEMENTARY SCHOOL                                 | SUP. LIV'G FACIL.  | 1  |
| 1. MINIMUM LIFE EXPECTANCY                         | BUILDING STATED TO BE                             | ARCHITECT STATES   |    |
| OF 40 YEARS  | IN EXCELLENT CONDITION                            | EXISTING BUILDING<br>QUALIFIES                                   |    |
| 2. CODE CONFORMANCE UPON OCCUPANCY                 | NOT DETERMINED; IN ITS                            | NEEDS UPGRADING TO   |    |
|  | CURRENT USE, IS IN                                | NURSING HOME CARE  |    |
|  | CONFORMANCE                                       | STATE AND VA CODES   |    |
| 3. ABILITY TO ACCOMODATE SPACE                     | NOT DEMONSTRATED,                                 | SPACE CAN BE ACCOM.  |    |
| AS PER V.A. GUIDELINES                             | WILL REQUIRE ADDITION                             | BY UTILIZATION OF<br>THREE FLOORS                                |    |
|  |   |  |    |
|  |   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                            | -  |
|  |   |  |    |
|  | ·   |  |    |
| II. Desired  |   |  |    |
| 1. SINGLE STORY STRUCTURE                          | A SINGLE STORY<br>ADDITION WOULD BE<br>PRACTICAL. | BEDROOMS ON TWO FLOORS<br>- DIFFICULT TO<br>SUPERVISE            |    |
| 2. EASE OF MAINTENANCE                             | NO DATA PRESENTED                                 | INTERIOR FINISHES ARE<br>APPROPRIATE, SOME<br>UPGRADING REQUIRED |    |
| 3. PROVEN ECONOMY OF OPERATION                     | NO DATA PRESENTED                                 | OPERATIONAL COSTS<br>PRESENTED FOR FUEL,<br>ELECTRIC, WATER      |    |
| 4. ADDITIONAL POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES                  |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·              |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
|  |   |  |    |
| III. Submittal Checklist                           |   |  |    |
| SUBSTANTIALLY IN CONFORMANCE<br>(SEE RFI P. 4-5) X | NO  | Х  |    |

# APPENDIX IV

**CITY #4:** Fairmont

**POPULATION:** 11,506

**SITE AREA:** Site A - 10 acres, of which 7 are buildable; Site B - 17 acres of which 9 are buildable.

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Site A is approximately 1.5 miles southwest and on the west shore of Lake Sisseton; Site B is approximately 1 mile south and slightly east of the downtown business district and approximately 6/10 mile south of the retail shopping mall.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Site A is from a local collector street named Fair Lakes Avenue. Site B is accessed from Johnson Street, an east-west minor arterial.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Site A is predominantly a low density single family detached residential neighborhood, while Site B is a more urbanized mix of land uses including single family residential, a church, a hospital and medical clinic.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Site A abuts single family housing on the south boundary, R-3 zoned property to the west, City nature park on the north and Lake Sisseton on the east. Site B is bounded on the north by an arterial roadway and single family detached housing, to the west is vacant land, to the east is the existing hospital and medical office building. The south abuts Johnson Street and R-3 zoned residential land.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Site A is bounded by R-1 and R-3 residential land, agricultural zoning and shoreland overlay district. Site B is bounded by R-1 and R-3 zoning districts.

**RETAIL USES:** Site A is remote from any apparent retail support services. Site B is within a short walk from the retail shopping mall.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** For both sites land use is compatible, however, distinct in character. Site A is very scenic, open and somewhat rural, while Site B is more urban in character with the hospital, clinic and abutting arterial roadways.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** In the instance of site A, the natural openness of the City nature park and the scenic tranquil aspects of Lake Sisseton adjacent to the low intensity single family residential neighborhood are positive attributes. Site B, in contrast, is more intensely developed and because of the R-3 zoning to the south, will in the future be a more intensely developed neighborhood. The hospital and clinic are positive influences, while the existing and future residential neighborhoods provide a residential quality which will be a positive influence as well.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Site A is rich in natural features including a very interesting topography and Lake Sisseton, while site B is a city setting.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Site A epitomizes the concept of prominence in that a future veterans' home could be situated at an elevation giving it a very prominent position with favorable views and vistas of the area; in particular to the east and the downtown business district areas.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Site A is generally square, measuring approximately 690 feet on a side. Site B has a suitable configuration.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The apparent difference in elevation from the lake level to the most prominent knob is approximately 50 feet. The kncll configuration of the land lends itself to an interesting architectural design solution.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** Very desirable, considering the south facing slope of the knoll.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Site A has a very desirable ambiance with its lakeshore setting and nature park area. Rezoning of the site from agricultural to a residential use may be problematic considering the fact that the land is currently classified as City park land. Site A, however, is without equivocation, one of the top contenders for further consideration.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Site A - Excellent; Site B - Good.

**CITY #5:** Fergus Falls

**POPULATION:** 12,519

SITE AREA: 9.4 acres

**SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT:** Approximately 12 blocks north of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Park Street is a local collector which intersects with Fir Street, an arterial road.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Low density residential.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Immediately to the south are 6 single family detached residences and just beyond Fir Street are B-1 and B-2 commercial businesses. East of the site are low density single family residential units and north and west is the regional treatment center campus.

ADJACENT ZONING: R-1 and R-2 residential zones exist to the east. To the south are B-1 and B-2 commercial districts and the property west and north is zoned R-A.

**RETAIL USES:** A limited amount of retail and service commercial is located about one city block south of the subject property.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: The regional treatment center and the extent of low density residential provide a sense of stability and neighborhood. The limited amount of business located south of Fir Street is considered supportive and compatible.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Shared services which may be available from the regional treatment center are certainly a attribute, as well as the campus-like setting including the athletic facilities which are available in close proximity. The residential housing is certainly a positive stabilizing factor to the neighborhood.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Most notable are the wooded areas that generally define the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of the proposed site. These edges consist of predominantly mature evergreen and some deciduous trees.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: To the east of the site, views would be limited by the existing single family residential development, however, to the west and north, the open space areas of the campus setting contribute to the visual aesthetic values of the site. Possible design solutions for this site may include building elevations of approximately 12 feet above Park Street which will provide some sense of prominence relative to development located south and east.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is generally rectangular, measuring approximately 520 feet east-west and 750 feet morth-south.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Site elevations in the extreme southeastern corner of the property are approximately 18 feet lower than elevations on the northwesterly property line. This topographic difference in elevation will provide opportunities for interesting design and use of the site.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** The site configuration and orientation lends itself well to maximizing solar utilization.

**CONCLUSIONS:** This site has valuable natural site features, including wooded areas, orientation and topographic relief. The site is well situated relative to adjoining land uses, open areas and the existing regional treatment center campus. Separate identity can be achieved by woodland and landscape areas. The prospect of shared services is an added advantage; detailed site design, orientation of the building and access can be accomplished to create a sense of autonomy.

**SITE CATEGORIZATION:** Excellent

**CITY #6:** Granite Falls

POPULATION: 3,451

SITE AREA: 10.5 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately  $1\frac{1}{4}$  miles east of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Oak Street (County Road 38) and Airport Drive are arterial roadways intersecting with Trunk Highway 23, located approximately  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles east.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Presently strong agricultural character, however, the potential exists for a great variety of uses based on zoning.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** To the west is residential low density, south is a City park, to the east is zoned limited industrial and to the north is agricultural.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Includes low density residential, parks, medium density, limited industrial and agricultural zoning districts.

**RETAIL USES:** Apparently available to the west in the Granite Falls business district.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** To the west and south is compatible, however, limited industrial exists to the east and to the southeast of the proposed site area. An existing VFW building is located adjacent to the north and eastern portions of the site. The agriculturally zoned property to the north and industrial properties to the east and south raise some possible future concern as to land use compatibility.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Certainly do exist between the single family residential and the park to the site's west and south boundaries, as well as perhaps the VFW club on the northeastern portion. However, noise, odors, hours of operation, architectural design and compatibility are questionable with respect to the industrial zoned land to the east and south on what is identified as outlots F and G.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Include a wooded area on the south boundary and a natural ravine which flows through the park area. Additionally there is a small depressional area in the southeast corner of the site.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Not perceived to be strong attributes of this site.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Generally rectangular, measuring approximately 1,000 feet on its north-south dimension and 440 feet east-west, with a 300 x 560 foot rectangular appendage on its eastern boundary. Although the site configuration is somewhat irregular, the proposer has illustrated a possible design solution which maximizes the use of the property.

IV-9

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The maximum grade change over the site is approximately 14 feet, with the lowest areas being situated in the southern area adjoining the City park.

## SOLAR ORIENTATION: Favorable.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Although this site has some strong favorable attributes and architectural design potential, its comparatively remote location (2 miles) from the City of Granite Falls is somewhat of a disadvantage, however, more important is the site's land use transitional character. A portion of the site is currently zoned RM, medium density residential, which seems to be appropriate considering single family low density and park land on the south and east, and the veterans' club and industrial zoned property on the east. This zoning and land use configuration is indicative of a transitional situation which is not the most conducive arrangement in the long range development scenarios.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Good

# CITY #7: Jasper

The City of Jasper proposed a building for consideration. The site was dropped from further consideration because of an insufficient response to the Request For Information specifically concerning mandatory criteria and required submittal-building information and attachments. CITY #8: Luverne

**POPULATION:** 4,568

SITE AREA: 12.6 Acres. ALTERNATIVE SITE: 12.91 Acres (Same relative City location)

**SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT:** Approximately 1.5 miles north on US Highway 75

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Arterial US Trunk Highway 75

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Low density residential and vacant land.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Low density residential

ADJACENT ZONING: R-1, 1 and 2 family residential

**RETAIL USES:** Include a small strip center located a few hundred feet south of the preferred site.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: Compatible

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** It is low density and residential to the west and south, with a proposed City park and ponding facility located north and east.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** There are no prominent on-site natural site amenities, however, the proposed ponding and park area north and east are a positive influence.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: To the northeast, over the City ponding and park area to potential residential development. Site elevations to the northeast continue to drop, suggesting some continued view toward the northern horizon.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The preferred site has a triangular configuration is measuring 948 feet on the south leg, 1,004 feet on its north leg and 1,324 feet on the final leg of the triangle. The alternative site is rectangular in form.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Gently drops to the northeast with approximately 10 foot maximum relief over the site.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: Could be maximized on the site because of the configuration and its length and width.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The sites are well situated relative to existing and future land use, retail outlets, park land and a ponding facility. They have easy access to Interstate via US Trunk Highway 75. Both sites may be vulnerable to Highway noise and visual impacts from Trunk Highway 75, adequate distance is available to buffer and screen and/or shift the building further north and east from the roadway. There is sufficient site and contiguous site amenity to provide considerable design flexibility, expansion and outdoor facilities.

**SITE CATEGORIZATION:** Sites A & B: Excellent

CITY #9: Madison

**POPULATION: 592** 

SITE AREA: 12.25 acres

**SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT:** Approximately 7 city blocks east of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** East-west collector known as 3rd Street intersecting with a north-south collector labeled 1st Avenue.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Single family detached residential along 3rd Street, as well as the athletic field.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** The site is apparently east of a Senior's apartment building. The other edges of the site abut expansive vacant land.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Classification includes general residential, farm residence and commercial on the south side of the site.

**RETAIL USES:** Presently available a short distance west in the central business district with possible future commercial south of the site.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** Under present existing conditions, it would appear that compatibility does exist, however, with a substantial area zoned commercial south of the site, future retail could be built and possibly inconsistent with a nursing care facility.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The elderly housing and the residential areas are preferred uses. The athletic field adds to the residential quality. Uncertainty with regard to the commercial zoned properties to the south, however, is problematic.

ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES: There is open land and wooded areas to the east which provide scenic value, however, no significant on-site natural amenities exist.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Primary building orientation would face to the east and northeast toward the areas which have been identified as scenic and tranquil wooded areas. Site elevations are not conducive to any sense of prominence.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is L-shaped with legs extending north-south and east-west. It would appear that the siting of a veterans' home on the site would not be hindered by the configuration, however, the utilization of open areas of the site are complicated by the configuration.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The site appears to be flat.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** No constraints are apparent.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The fact that the southern portion of the site abuts a commercial zoning district is a less desirable situation due, in part, to the uncertainties associated with retail compatibility. The L-shaped configuration of the property is problematic with respect to expansion plans and optimal use of outdoor spaces.

**SITE CATEGORIZATION:** Adequate

**CITY #10:** Madison Lake

**POPULATION:** 592

**SITE AREA:** Site 1: Up to 7 acres. Site 2: From 2 to 5 acres. Site 3: Approximately 3 acres.

**SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT:** Site 1: Approximately 3 city blocks south. Sites 2 and 3: Approximately 2 city blocks east.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Point Avenue, a collector intersecting with Trunk Highway 60 in the instance of site #1.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Rural agricultural and single family detached residential for Site #1.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Site #1 is the preferred candidate site for Madison Lake. The adjacent land uses include residential single family, mobile homes to the north and wetland and Madison Lake to the south and east.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Include R-1 single family detached residential on both the east and the west frontages with R-2 mobile home classifications to the north. To the south is Madison Lake.

**RETAIL USES:** Within walking distance of the downtown business district.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** Compatibility exists with the exception of the mobile home court on the northern boundary of site #1.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Include the single family residential districts and the low intensity land use characterized by private homes.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Include Madison Lake, park land and a wetland on the southern edge of the site.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Particularly relevant to site #1 considering the expansive views to the south and to southeast along the wooded peninsula extending into Madison Lake.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The buildable area of site #1 is approximately rectangular, measuring about 560 feet north-south and on an average, 400 feet east-west. Sites 2 & 3 are irregular shaped platted lots bounded by existing streets.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Low on the south side with marsh grasses in the fringe areas of the wetland, however the site rises quite rapidly in elevation approaching the northern extremity.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: No restrictions.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Although site #3 has approximately 3 acres of land, the configuration is somewhat restrictive and may require a far too complicated building and site use plan. Site #2 is approximately 5 acres in area and does have some advantages, however, it is noticeably lacking strong attributes when compared to site #1, the focus of this evaluation. Site #1's proximity to the lake, the wetland, park land and good highway access, along with a site area of approximately 6 acres and its general rectangular configuration make it the preferred Madison Lake site. A nearby fishing dock and public beach add to the favorability of this site. Screening of the trailer court to the north and extensive site landscaping would further enhance the suitability of this site.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Sites 1 & 2: Good; Site 3: Adequate.

**CITY #11:** Mankato

POPULATION: 28,651

SITE AREA: 9.9 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately  $1\frac{1}{4}$  miles south and east.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Balcerzak Drive appears to be a minor east-west collector intersecting with Monks Avenue, a north-south collector.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Mixed uses including general business, community business, one and two family residential units and multiple dwellings.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** An arena is located northwest of the site. Immediately north are multiple family units; east are platted residential lots. The south boundary includes vacant land, institutional, commercial and recreation. West of the site is multiple family residential.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Include general commercial north and west, R-2 - one and two single family dwellings north. East is R-1 - single family zoning; south single family and west is R-3 limited multiple dwellings.

**RETAIL USES:** Retail and service commercial are within one to two miles from the proposed site. A small retail mall is located just south on Monks Avenue a few hundred feet.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: The predominant land use in the area is multiple family rental units. The all-seasons ice arena and a health club add to the mix of uses, along with future single family residential and a future elementary school south and east. This pattern of land uses, and in particular the rental properties, suggests a more transitory neighborhood environment which can be viewed as less compatible than other more cohesive neighborhood environments.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The future single family and future elementary school south and east of the site would add stability to the area; the apartments and mix of uses add to the area, but not stability or tranquility.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** With the exception of a low area south of the site, no natural physical features are on the site or in the area.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Due to the extent of development in the area and the lack of any significant land form or natural amenities, no particularly desirable visual or esthetic value is generated from this site.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is rectangular and measures approximately 560 feet by 740 feet.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The site slopes subtly to the southeast property corner. The site is typically flat.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** No limitations are imposed by property configuration or physical site constraints.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The land use context of the site is varied and characterized as transitional. A sense of permanence is lacking. No substantial positive features distinguish this parcel. The neighborhood land use is not compatible or particularly supportive. Although the land use and zoning are in conformance, conflicts due to intensity of existing land uses, traffic and previous land use development patterns exist.

**SITE CATEGORIZATION:** Adequate

### CITY #12: Marshall

#### POPULATION: 11,161

SITE AREA: Site A: 7.37 acres - Site A was substantially downgraded because of its proximity to a cemetery which appears to be contiguous to the site's northerly 854 foot property line. Site B: 4.8 acres.

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 6 blocks west and north.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Collector with access to West Main Street, an arterial and Trunk Highway 23 bypass.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Primarily residential, with significant open space, parks and school area.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Includes Independence Park, low density residential, Park Side Elementary School and a small retail center.

ADJACENT ZONING: Includes limited business and residential.

**RETAIL USES:** Include a small retail center adjacent to the site's easterly property line.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: Compatible

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Institutional, recreational, low density residential and limited retail.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Includes the extensive open area of Independence Park and the recreational facilities which include tennis, hard surface court play areas, parking facility, play structures, ponding areas, pathways an amphitheater and a sliding hill.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** predominantly to the southwest into the park area.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Square, approximately 450 feet per side.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Approximately 12 foot rise in elevation which is certainly a positive attribute, providing the potential for an elevated building pad with views extending over the park activity areas to the west and south.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: Potentially ideal.

**CONCLUSIONS:** This site B has favorable contiguous land uses and a positive entrance image. The Trunk Highway 23 bypass is close to the proposed site, however the distances would accommodate some screening of the highway, along with landscaping and/or building design orientation to offset the presence of the highway. Although there is evidence of a cemetery located south of the park property boundaries abutting Trunk Highway 23 bypass, the intervening land form which is used for sliding, provides a distance which seems to mitigate any view impact of the cemetery. The site has good topographic relief and excellent views into the park area. The elementary school to the north, along with the small retail outlet to the east, add to the fine attributes of this site.

**SITE CATEGORIZATION:** Site B: Excellent; Site A: Adequate.

**CITY #13:** Montevideo

**POPULATION:** 5,845

SITE AREA: 5.5 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Apparently the site is within a few blocks of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** 11th Street, a local collector and Ashmore Avenue on the north, an east-west collector.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Primarily residential including a trailer park, multi-family housing and a medical campus.

ADJACENT LAND USE: North of the site is a mobile home park, to the east is vacant land, southeast is a Pamida retail outlet, east and south are a clinic, hospital and nursing home, west and southwest are multiple family housing units, vacant land and a church.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** North, east and south are residential and multiple residential zoning districts. The eastern boundary of the proposed site is currently unzoned and outside of the City limit. It is represented that land area east of the site would be zoned multiple residential at some future date.

**RETAIL USES:** Retail establishments are a short distance to the west on Ashmore Avenue and also located south fronting Trunk Highway 7.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** The land use context is mixed and includes the trailer homes, multi-family residential, the clinic, the hospital, a church and Pamida, not particularly suggestive of a strongly established neighborhood. None of the existing land uses are particularly incompatible, however, there is perhaps more land use variety than appropriate.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The church, the medical facilities and the retail outlets do, of course, provide value to the site, however, the mobile home court and the multi-family residential is somewhat less supportive and excessive.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** There appear to be no natural features to benefit a future veterans' home site.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: Based on the existing development of the area and possible future development east of the site, no particularly valuable views or vista exist. No elevation grade change on the site provides an opportunity for elevating the site and providing prominence.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is an L-shaped form which wraps around the existing clinic site. The approximate dimensions are 600 feet by 600 feet.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Relatively level.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** The L-shaped configuration of the property will accommodate a site design with exposure to the south and southwest.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The site is situated in a pattern of existing land use which provides a variety of opportunities including medical and retail uses, however, the image of the area is somewhat transitional and transitory when considering the mobile home and multiple family uses. L-shaped parcel configurations pose design solution difficulty as compared with rectangular or square land forms and create additional design problems with regard to the use and relationship of outside spaces, namely the entry area, parking lot, passive open space and green areas.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Good

CITY #14: New Ulm

### POPULATION: 13,755

SITE AREA: 9.2 acres, approximately 6.5 to 7 acres buildable

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 6 blocks west.

PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY: Major collector known as Garden Street.

PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER: Residential and institutional.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Low density single family residential to the east. To the south is the Realife Building and an existing hospital. Heavily wooded and agricultural zoned land to the west and north.

ADJACENT ZONING: Residential or agricultural.

**RETAIL USES:** Within 10 city blocks.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: Compatible

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Includes the positive attributes of the hospital and the complimentary image and character of the single family housing. The natural wooded and sloped areas on the southern, northern and western boundaries of the site are very positive.

ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES: Include the holding pond area leased by the City, the steep slopes and upland woodland areas.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Views to the east and north could be substantial because of the elevation of the site. However, views to the southeast into the hospital parking areas and rooftops may be less desirable.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Roughly rectangular, measuring approximately 660 feet by 630 feet.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Very dramatic from a flood plain elevation of approximately 171 feet to 280 feet which equals 109 foot difference in elevation. Although this topographic relief is a strong physical site characteristic, it poses some degree of difficulty relative to a single story structure and site drainage from the upland areas down to the City designated pond area in the foreground of the property.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: Somewhat problematic in that the proposed siting of the structure is in the sloped areas, the woodland area and on a northeast facing slope. The siting of the structure on this hillside would most likely be in the shadow of the woodland area.

**CONCLUSIONS:** Although the site has positive adjoining land use relationships, the negative physical aspects of the site, namely shaded slopes, severe topographic variations (nearly 50 feet difference in elevation within the proposed parking and building areas) and the prospects of a 100 year storm, flooding portions of the Garden Street leave this site with several questions.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Adequate

CITY #15: Redwood Falls

### **POPULATION:** 5,210

SITE AREA: Includes 3 parcels. Primary parcel is 5.46 acres and includes the existing residential structure. The second and third parcels are 2.85 and 1.93 acres respectively.

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 6 blocks east.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Includes a local street (Elm Street) intersecting with Patten Street, a collector and Bridge Street (Highways 71/19) which is an arterial.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** From Trunk Highway 71 and 19, the uses are primarily limited community retail and light and general industrial uses. In addition, multi-family residential and mobile home uses exist immediately south of the subject site.

ADJACENT LAND USE: Includes the fairgrounds, mobile home court, single family residential, a public park, storm water ponding and mixed commercial/industrial uses.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Include to the north is R-4 multiple family zoning, a RM mobile home park district, R-4 multi-family to the south, and extensive B-2 limited community retail along Bridge Street along with B-3 auto oriented districts and general industrial districts.

**RETAIL USES:** Conveniently located within 2 to 3 blocks of the subject.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** Questionable and considered not desirable in view of the commercial/industrial uses and the mobile home court.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Would include the single family detached housing. The Redwood County Fairgrounds may be a positive influence, the park land and ponding areas to the north.

ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES: Very limited.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: Not noteworthy.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Generally rectangular, measuring 1,333 feet on its east-west dimension and 260 north-south.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Drops approximately 12 feet to the north toward the public park land and ponding area. Site has been graded to accommodate the existing 3 story residential home.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: Existing structure orients east and west with a south facing building facade, the northern exposure is to the public park and ponding facility.

**CONCLUSIONS:** From a land use and site location perspective, this site is not particularly desirable due to a great extent of mixed and/or multiple land use. The configuration of the property being approximately a quarter mile long east and west and as narrow as 140 foot on the westerly leg, provides a fair amount of land area, but with limited value relative to providing a quality setting for the building, appropriate buffers, screening and spacial separation from other adjoining uses.

The proposal includes the 35,000 square foot 3 story masonry structure. The conversion of this 3 story facility to meet the requirements of a skilled nursing care facility would be extensive. It is our opinion that the result and cost of such renovations on this site, within its given land use context, would produce a marginal end result.

The three story configuration would result in inefficient staffing and probably increased operation costs.

**SITE CATEGORIZATION:** Adequate

CITY #16: St. Peter

POPULATION: 9,056

SITE AREA: 14 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 1 mile south of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** US Highway 169, an arterial roadway.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** A semi-private access from US Highway 169 to the site is possible. This access road would also serve as a secondary or emergency access into the adjoining regional treatment center site.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** To the east and north is the existing St. Peter RTC; to the west is vacant agricultural and woodland; southeast and paralleling 169 are three scattered single family homesites.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** The proposed site is in an R-3 zoning district which includes the RTC campus.

**RETAIL USES:** The central business district is approximately a mile north. Highway service commercial zoning is approximately  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile north of the subject property.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** The vacant wooded low density residential areas to the north and west are very conducive to the proposed use, along with the existing hospital campus to the north and primarily east of the proposed site. The Regional Treatment Center is able to provide support services should this be deemed appropriate.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The fact that a majority of the land within the site's vicinity is zoned as the RTC suggests a positive future continuity in land use. The fact that the Minnesota River is immediately to the south of Highway 169 and that agricultural and camping areas are to the west and north suggests further the suitability of this site for the proposed use. No apparent negative land use or zoning factors influence this site.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** The site's north and west boundary is, in part, defined by a rather dramatic band of steep slopes that measure in height to 50 feet. This steep slope ridge is heavily wooded, along with the other boundaries of the site. This woodland perimeter provides an invaluable sense of seclusion and separate identity. The presence of the Minnesota River also adds to the natural and historic value of the site.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Because the site has a relatively superior elevation to the river and Highway 169, it would be conceivable that partial clearing of the perimeter woodland would allow views down the Minnesota River corridor. Additional lookouts or observatories could be created along the steep sloped areas, adding further to the aesthetics of the site. The site elevation further adds to the sense of prominence; being elevated above the highway and the river.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The parcel is generally a triangular form, fronting on US Highway 169 and Freeman Drive, with the second leg of the triangle being defined essentially by a natural drainage swale and ravine on the east side of the site and the remaining third side is generally defined as the bluff line and wooded ridge along the west and north face.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The actual building area of the site experiences about a 5 to 6 foot change in elevation, however, the real advantage topographically is the fact that the site is elevated above the highway 6 to 8 feet and a very dramatic topographic change occurs along the north and west boundary by virtue of the sloped ridge. The topographic plateaus from the river to the upland areas are a positive site attribute.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** The physical land area and orientation of the topography will accommodate good access to solar angles.

**CONCLUSIONS:** This site candidate's topographic features, natural site amenities, proximity to the Minnesota River and land use context contribute to its very positive rating as a veterans' home site.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Excellent

CITY #17: Slayton

**POPULATION:** 2,420

SITE AREA: 6.6 acres, including approximately 4.06 buildable acres.

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: The site appears to be approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile southeast of the Central Business District area.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** 26th Street is a local street which combines with Front Street and intersects with Highway 59, an arterial roadway.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Primary image and character is single family residential on either side of Front and Oak Street.

ADJACENT LAND USE: The eastern frontage of the property abuts the right-of-way of US Trunk Highway 59. East of the site is generally low density residential. The geological maps, which accompanied the submission, indicates that the southern boundary of the property includes former Northwestern Railroad rightof-way which may account for the somewhat underutilized land immediately south of the site.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Property to the west and south is zoned R-2, medium density residential. Property east of the site and Trunk Highway 59 is zoned A-0 agricultural open space; property contiguous to the north is zoned B-1, highway business district, however, a portion of the land to the north in the vicinity of 25th Street is guided for residential uses.

**RETAIL USES:** It would appear that the intersection of 20th Street and Trunk Highway 59 is the center of commercial activity and the central business district is located west approximately 4 city blocks.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** Based on the comprehensive land use plan, property on the north, west and south edges of the site are guided for residential uses. To the west is Trunk Highway 59 and an "old lake bed". The fact that Trunk Highway 59 right-of-way and travel surfaces are relatively close to this site may have some negative impace and incompatibility. However, generally the remaining three sides do demonstrate compatibility.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The single family residential land uses do bring a sense of permanency and stability to the area, however, the highway detracts from this neighborhood character. Beyond Trunk Highway 59 is the abandoned lake bed which provides some positive aesthetic value.

ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES: Some scattered deciduous and evergreen trees are present on the site and a low lying drainage ponding area abuts the highway right-of-way. The low depressional area is not, however, viewed as a positive site feature because of the proximity and influence of Highway 59.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Primary views from the site would be to the abandoned lake bed beyond Trunk Highway 59. These views are somewhat questionable, however, they may provide some interest to future residents.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is generally a triangular configuration, however, on the western edge, the property boundary is interrupted by a series of 5 lots which penetrate into the triangular configuration. This situation creates a parcel which is somewhat restrictive in terms of building design flexibility and limits the ability to relate open space to building functions. It is understood that additional land would be available to the south in the extent of approximately 1.75 acres.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The site slopes gently to the northeast. The difference in elevation, based on USGS mapping appears to be 15 to 20 feet from north to south. However, based on the provided photos, this topographic change does not provide any separation from the travel lanes of Trunk Highway 59.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** Some restriction is imposed due to the configuration of the property.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The site does have some positive view orientation to the northeast, however, this is degraded by the presence of Trunk Highway 59, an arterial roadway. The configuration of the property and its size place limitations on design flexibility. Little opportunity for physical grade separation is available to mitigate the negative impacts of Trunk Highway 59. The parcel has a feeling of restrictiveness and lacks natural physical amenities.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Adequate

CITY #18: Tracy

**POPULATION: 2,478** 

SITE AREA: 10 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 7 city blocks east of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** State Street is a local collector to Center Street, which intersects with US 14 and Lyon County No. 14.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Low density single family residential and institutional.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Immediately to the west is the Christian Manor Nursing Home and the municipal hospital. Existing single family detached homes are also on the west property line. On the north, east and south boundaries are agricultural lands actively being tilled.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** The site is zoned R-2 which is a multi-family residential district; this includes the hospital and nursing home to the west. Properties to the east and south are not designated, while properties beyond the R-2 district in a westerly direction are R-1, one and two family low density uses.

**RETAIL USES:** The central business district appears to be the nearest retail.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** The low density single family residential uses, along with the existing hospital and nursing home do provide compatibility.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The single family housing provides a residential quality important to the siting of a veterans' home, while the hospital provides an important support service.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** No distinctive natural features are apparent, however, the extensive agricultural lands in the north, east and south certainly provide a rural character typical of the region.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: No particularly unique aspect of the site provides a prominence and/or visual experience beyond that associated with the immediate views of the nursing home, hospital, housing and agricultural lands.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The parcel is generally rectangular and measures approximately 700 feet per side.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The site appears to be generally flat with perhaps a gentle slope toward the east.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** No restrictions are imposed by the site.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The site has reasonably good land use context, however, the lack of desirable natural features minimizes the overall favorability of the site.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Good

## CITY #19: Tyler

POPULATION: 1,353

SITE AREA: 9.73 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 1 mile south and east of the Central Business District.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Bergstrom Street, a local street on the north property boundary and County Highway 20 and US Trunk Highway 14, arterial roadways on the south property boundary.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Rural from the southeast and residential, institutional from the northwest.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** To the west of the property is single family detached housing; southeast is a water softening facility, further east is an iron sales business, and the highways are immediately south.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Includes residential and industrial southeast along County Road 20.

**RETAIL USES:** Within 6 city blocks of the subject.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** The sporadic pattern of development around the site reveals uses such as iron sales, water softener, agricultural land, multi-family and a medical facility. The character and diversity of uses is somewhat transitory in nature.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Rural residential and medical facilities.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** No apparent desirable natural features exist.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: Nothing of significance.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The parcel is a complicated multi-sided series of rectangles with 2 exceptions, one being located on the northern central portion of the site and the other in the southeastern corner. Overall dimensions however, are approximately 700 by 500 feet.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Relatively flat; previously planned for single family subdivision.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: No constraints.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The site boundary configuration is problematic in that a design for use of the property would require carefully working around the exceptions and utilization of the site extremities for useful purpose. The mixed pattern of land use does not establish a strong positive trend for the area in terms of land use continuity.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Adequate

## CITY #20: Waseca

## **POPULATION:** 8,219

SITE AREA: Site 1 - 15 acres, Site 2 - 12 acres, Site 3 - 11 acres, Site 4 - 8.75 acres, Site 5 - 12 acres, Site 6 - 9.3 acres, Site 7 - 9.57 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Sites 1, 2 and 3 are approximately 1 mile north of the central business district. Sites 4, 5 and 6 are within a mile of the central business district and located south and slightly east. Site 7 is approximately 1 mile north and west of the central business district.

Site #1 was considered Excellent. Sites #2-7 were downgraded for the following reasons:

Sites 2 & 3: Pastoral setting, no lake view favoring site #1.

Site 4: B-2 commercial uses may conflict with Home Annexation required.

Site 5: Excessive roadway frontage, shallow depth, industrial zoning to the south.

Site 6: Long and narrow (326' x 1206') frontage on roadway.

Site 7: Long and narrow (530' x 1320'), remote, somewhat isolated.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Will consist of an extension of 19th Avenue NE, a local roadway which will intersect with Clear Lake Road to the southeast and 3rd Street NE on the west, a primary collector roadway.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Single family detached residential and open natural vacant land, with views to Clear Lake.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** Include agricultural and wetlands to the north, low density residential on all other property boundaries, except for a portion of park and open space on the southern edge of the site.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Includes R-1 suburban residential and undesignated open or agricultural districts.

**RETAIL USES:** B-2 and B-3 retail districts are located approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile west of the site.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: Would be compatible with the proposed use.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Include the natural wetland areas, both north and south of the buildable portion of this site, as well as a 3 acre City park facility proposed for an area south of 19th Avenue extended. The existing low density single family residential to the west is a positive influence.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Includes a view of Clear Lake, which is approximately 900 feet south and east of the site. The on-site and off-site wetlands both north and south are a positive visual amenity, in addition to the existing woodland on the east property line.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** The site does have a view to Clear Lake. Site e levations are slightly above lake elevations. Some sense of prominence can be gained from the height of the site relative to the expansive vistas to the south and southeast.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is approximately rectangular with a "pan handle" extension to Clear Lake. The site is approximately 1,300 feet north-south and 660 feet east-west.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Approximately 17 feet of elevation change occurs from the northern wetland area to the central high land area. The highest point on the site is elevation 1,134.8 and the contours drop gently in all directions from this knob.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** Excellent, relative to the physical dimensions of the parcel and the high spot.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The existing and future land uses surrounding site #1 are compatible and on-site and off-site natural features including wetlands, wood land, park land and Clear Lake are very desirable. The possible future extension of 19th Avenue NE is not viewed as a negative factor in that it is a local roadway serving the residences further west. The views and vistas are real attributes for consideration.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Site 1: Excellent; Sites 2 & 3: Good; Sites 4-7: Adequate.

CITY #21: Willmar

**POPULATION:** 15,895

SITE AREA: Sites A, B and C are on a 190 acre regional treatment center and range in size from 10 to 25 acres.

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 2 miles north and east.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** Highway 71/23, State Trunk Highway 23 and US Trunk Highway 71 bypass to Civic Center Drive. These are collector and arterial roadways.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Along Highway 71/23 the image would be open and relatively natural because of Willmar Lake` and the lack of urbanization.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** To the east is the golf club, and Swan and Willmar Lakes. To the south is the Willmar Regional Treatment Center. To the west is Minnesota Department of Transportation District Headquarter offices, Highway 71 and 23, a state game refuge and the City ice arena.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Agricultural or government/institutional.

**RETAIL USES:** 2 miles to Central Business District.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** Conducive and compatible to the proposed use.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Include the shared services with the Regional Treatment Center and the tranquil nature of the lakes, golf course and campus-like setting.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** Willmar Lake. On-site amenities include some woodland along the periphery.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** Especially evident to this site because of its relatively high elevation above the lake.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Undefined in that the entire 190 acre site is owned by the State and is unplatted. If, however, Alternative Site B were selected, which is the preferred site of the three, the configuration of that parcel would be triangular, with the southern leg being approximately 1,100 feet, the western leg of the triangle being approximately 1,600 feet and the third leg of the triangle approximately 2,200 feet (approximately 20 acres).

**TOPOGRAPHY:** A prominent advantage of this site is its elevation, approximately 50 feet above the elevation of Willmar Lake.

**SOLAR ORIENTATION:** Virtually unobstructed.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The Willmar site is a strong candidate because of its topographic elevations, prominence above the lake elevation with views to the south, west and northwest. Shared services with the RTC are proposed. Possible noise and visual impacts from US Trunk Highway 71 bypass would have to be investigated more thoroughly, however, its conceivable that these impacts can be mitigated by distance, berming, building orientation and visual screening. The positive attributes of the site and the low intensity of surrounding land use are strong positive influences on this site. Site B has valued views of the lake and greater potential for separation from the RTC.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Site B: Excellent; Sites A & C: Good.

CITY #22: Windom

**POPULATION:** 4,666

SITE AREA: 5.14 Acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately 12 city blocks north

**APPARENT PRIMARY ACCESS:** A local street serving the municipal hospital and intersecting with trunk highways

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Primarily rural, expansive and undeveloped.

ADJACENT LAND USE: Municipal hospital, public open land and Trunk Highway 60

ADJACENT ZONING: Indicates R-B, open, B-2 and I-2 uses

**RETAIL USES:** Possibly adjacent to the site or east of Trunk Highway 60 or approximately six blocks south.

**ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY:** Acceptable, with the exception of the uncertainties associated with the B-2 and the I-2 zoned areas. Although these zoned districts are not immediately contiguous to the proposed site, they do front along the entrance roadway serving to the site.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** Compatibility of the R-B zoning district and the hospital.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** No apparent adjacent amenities or natural features exist, however, immediately adjacent to Trunk Highway 60 is Perkins Creek.

**VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE:** The site has approximately eight feet of relief, with the lowest elevations along Trunk Highway 60 and Perkins Creek; the higher spots are close to the hospital.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** The site is approximately rectangular, measuring 695± feet in length and 772± feet in width.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** Drops approximately eight feet to the east.

SOLAR ORIENTATION: Adequate, however the longest dimension of the site is generally north and south.

**CONCLUSIONS:** The site is large enough to accommodate the proposal. Its proximity to the hospital is certainly a desirable factor, however, its proximity to Trunk Highway 60 and the apparent elevation of the site and the highway provide minimal opportunity for visual and sound impact mitigation. No particularly significant on or off-site natural amenities are present. Soil reports indicate soils are problematic; some soils require removal replacement. Entrance roadways are quite adequate, however, some potential for less than optimal land uses along the entry exist because of the B-2 and I-2 zoning.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Good

CITY #23: Worthington

**POPULATION:** 10,243

SITE AREA: 9.4 - 11.4 acres

SITE LOCATION RELATIVE TO CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT: Approximately  $2\frac{1}{4}$  miles east around Lake Okabena

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROADWAY:** County State Aid Highway 10, an arterial and West Shore Drive, a lakeshore collector road.

**PRIMARY ACCESS ROAD IMAGE AND CHARACTER:** Institutional, single family residential and natural.

**ADJACENT LAND USE:** South of the site is Okabena Lake; southwest are large lot single family residences; to the northeast are single family detached homes and platted lots; and to the north is the Worthington Community College campus.

**ADJACENT ZONING:** Include institutional on the north, natural features district on the south and R-1, one family detached residential south and west.

**RETAIL USES:** Appear to be available just north of the college campus at County Road 10 and Collegeway, and of course, the central business district.

ADJOINING LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND SUITABILITY: The primary college campus is located approximately 4 mile north and east of the subject site. The intervening campus property is recreational ball fields and open areas. The existing residential to the east and southwest are compatible uses and the lake provides a pleasant visual and open area amenity.

**POSITIVE ATTRIBUTES OF ADJOINING USES AND ZONING:** The spaciousness of the college campus athletic fields to the north and the recreational value of these sites for both active and passive purposes are highly desirable. The residential uses of the area provide a stability and residential character.

**ADJACENT OR ONSITE NATURAL FEATURES:** The site, based on aerial photography, has significant overstory woodland which would provide for interesting site design solutions. A series of ravines on the north and south sides of the property add interest to the site and the presence of the lake will provide an excellent backdrop.

VIEWS, VISTAS AND PROMINENCE: Views to the north and east could be extensive, however, views in a southerly and southwesterly direction may be inhibited by existing woodland areas. The site is slightly in excess of 10 feet above the lake level elevation and generally drops in elevation to the northeast, east and south, providing some sense of prominence.

**PARCEL CONFIGURATION:** Generally rectangular and measures approximately 440 feet north-south and 1,000 feet east-west.

**TOPOGRAPHY:** The proposed location for the building and parking structure are on a knob of high ground with elevations sloping downward in a northerly, easterly and southerly direction. The slope of the site in 3 directions is into the ravine areas which drain land from the north and west. This topographic configuration of the land is viewed very favorably.

IV-38

# SOLAR ORIENTATION: Appears to be unobstructed.

**CONCLUSIONS:** This proposed site provides several physical site amenities and features deemed highly desirable. The campus setting, open space and athletic field areas, as well as the single family residential context make this site a strong candidate. Access to County State Aid Highway 10 to the west and Lake Okabena further enhance the desirability of this property.

SITE CATEGORIZATION: Excellent