Minnesota Department of Transportation
Transportation Building, St. Paul, MN 55155

October 1991
(612) 296-1662

TO : Municipal Engineers

SUBJECT : 1991 Municipal State Aid Needs Report

Gentlemen :

Enclosed is a copy of the 1991 Municipal State Aid Needs Report, which will be reviewed October 29 \& 30 by the Screening Board to make a final determination of the money needs.

This report has been compiled by the Municipal State Aid Needs Unit in conjunction with the Office of Finance. If you have any questions or suggestions concerning this data; please contact me at the above number.

Distribution of this report is sent to all Municipal Engineers, and when a consulting engineer is engaged by the municipality, a copy is also sent to the municipal clerk.

A limited amount of additional copies of this report are available on request.

Sincerely,
Per deuce
Kenneth straus
Municipal State Aid Needs Unit

Enclosures:
1991 Municipal State Aid Needs Report

## PREFACE

The "1991 Municipal State Aid Needs Report" is presented to the Municipal Screening Board for use in making their annual money needs recommendation to the Commissioner of Transportation. This submittal is required by Mn. Statute 162.13 Sub . 3 and is to be made to the commissioner on or before November 1 of each year FOR HIS DETERMINATION.

The money needs data contained in this publication has been COMPILED FROM REPORTING SUBMITTED BY EACH INDIVIDUAL MUNICIPALITY. Design is established by State Aid Standards based on traffic, and the money needs are calculated using the unit prices as determined by the Screening Board at their spring meeting in June, 1991.

The 1990 Census data is combined with the Commissioner's final money needs determination and is the resulting 1992 allocation which Will be reported in the " 1992 Municipal State Aid Apportionment Data" to be published in January, 1992.
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1991 MUNICIPAL SCREENING BOARD
OFFICERS

| Chairman | Jim Grube | St. Louis Park | (612) | 924-2551 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vice Chairman | Dan Edwards | Fergus Falls | (218) | 739-2251 |
| Secretary | Alan Gray | Eden Prairie | (612) | 937-2262 |

MEMBERS

| District | Served | Representative |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | Jim Prusak |
| 2 | 1 | David Kildahl |
| 3 | 1 | Sidney Williamson |
| 4 | 3 | Alvin Moen |
| 5 | 2 | Michael Eastling |
| 6 | 3 | Tom Drake |
| 7 | 2 | Pete McClurg |
| 8 | 1 | Dale Swanson |
| 9 | 2 | Ken Haider |
| (Three Cities | Kenneth Larson |  |
| of the |  | Marvin Hoshaw |
| First Class) | Thomas Kuhfeld |  |

Cloquet
Crookston
Sauk Rapids
Alexandria
Richfield
Red Wing
New Ulm
Willmar
Maplewood
Duluth
Minneapolis
St. Paul

| Hermantown | (218) $727-8456$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Bemidji | $(218) 751-5610$ |
| Buffalo | $(612) 253-1000$ |
| Moorhead | $(218) 299-5390$ |
| Prior Lake | $(612) 447-4230$ |
| Owatonna | $(507) 451-4541$ |
| Mankato | $(507) 625-3161$ |
| Marshall | $(507) 537-6774$ |
| Oakdale | $(612) 739-5086$ |
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Clyde Busby - Chairman
Hibbing
(218) 262-3486

Expires in 1991

Charles Siggerud
Burnsville
(612) 895-4400

Expires in 1992

Joe Bettendorf
Litchfield
(612) 252-4740

EXPIRES IN 1993

Fred Moore - Chairman
Plymouth
(612) 550-5000

Expires in 1991

Ron Rudrud
BLOOMINGTON
(612) 881-5811

Expires in 1992

Bruce Bullert
SAVAGE
(612) 890-1045

EXPIRES IN 1993

## ALLOCATION STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE

(Presently not appointed by the commissioner)

| Chairman | - Bruce Bullert - Savage | (612) | 890-1045 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gerald Butcher - Maple Grove | (612) | 420-4000 |
|  | Tom Drake - Red Wing | (612) | 227-6220 |
|  | John Flora - Fridley | (612) | 571-3450 |
|  | Jim Grube - St. Louis Park | (612) | 924-2551 |
|  | Ramankutty Kannakutty - Minneapolis | (612) | 673-2456 |
|  | Ken Larson - Duluth | (218) | 723-3278 |
|  | Lowell Odland - Golden Valley | (612) | 545-3781 |
|  | Bill Ottensmann - Coon Rapids | (612) | 755-2880 |
|  | Chuck Siggerud - Burnsville | (612) | 895-4400 |

MUNICIPAL SCREENING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES
Districts and First Class Cities

| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ---- | . | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1972 | BOYER | WIDSETH | REED <br> Brainerd | RONNING <br> Fergus Falls | LANGSETH Bloomington | JOHNSON | OTHMAN | PRIEBE |
| 1973 | BOYER | WIDSETH | REED | LARSON <br> Detroit Lakes | STROJAN | ARMSTRONG | OTHMAN | PRIEBE |
| 1974 | MADSEN Hibbing | SANDERS <br> E. Gr. Forks | KNAPP | LARSON | STROJAN | BOLLANT Winona | OTHMAN | CARLSOH |
| 1975 | MADSEN | SANDERS | KNAPP | REIMER Moorhead | ASMUS <br> Minnetonka | BOLLANT | MENK <br> St. Peter | CARLSON |
| 1976 | BOYER | HIDSETH | KRIHA Brainerd | REIMER | ODLAND | ANDERSON Red Wing | MENK | ADEN <br> Marshall |
| 1977 | PFUTZENREUTER <br> Virginia | WIDSETH | KRIHA | RONNING <br> Fergus Falls | ODLAND | ANDERSON | MENK | ADEN |
| 1978 | PFUTZENREUTER | WIDSETH | KRIHA | RONNING | BUTCHER Maple Grove | ANDERSON | PUTNAM <br> New Ulm | ADEN |
| 1979 | PFUTZENREUTER | VENCEL <br> Bemidji | ENGSTRON <br> Little Falls | RONNING | BUTCHER | ANDERSON | PUTNAM | CARLSON |
| 1980 | MADSEN | VENCEL | ENGSTRON | REIMER | BUTCHER | LEUTH <br> Owatonna | PUTNAM | CARLSON |
| 1981 | PFUTZENREUTER | WIDSETH | ENGSTRON | REIMER | ASMUS | LEUTH | ORTLOFF Waseca | CARLSON |
| 1982 | PFUTZENREUTER <br> Virginia | FREEBERG <br> Bemidji | DOLENTZ <br> St. Cloud | BAKKEN <br> Detroit Lakes | ASMUS | LEUTH | ORTLOFF | ADEN |
| 1983 | PRUSAK <br> cloquet | FREEBERG | DOLENTZ | BAKKEN | ASMUS | PLUMB <br> Rochester | ORTLOFF | ADEN |
| 1984 | PRUSAK | FREEBERG | DOLENTZ | BAKKEN | RUDRUD Bloomington | PLUMB | MENK | ADEN |
| 1985 | PRUSAK | SANDERS | SCHWENINGER Brainerd | BAKKEN | RUDRUD | PLUMB | MENK | RODEBERG <br> Montevideo |
| 1986 | BUSBY <br> Hibbing | SANDERS | SCHWENINGER | EDWARDS <br> Fergus Falls | RUDRUD | MURPHY <br> Austin | MENK | RODEBERG |
| 1987 | BUSBY | SANDERS | SCHWENINGER | EDHARDS | OTTENSMANN Coon Rapids | MURPHY | HAFFIELD Worthington | RODEBERG |
| 1988 | BUSBY | WALKER <br> Th River Falls | MAURER <br> Elk River | EDWARDS | OTTENSMANN | MURPHY | HAFFIELD | BETTENDORF <br> Litchfield |
| 1989 | DRAGISICH <br> Virginia | WALKER | MAURER | MOEN <br> Al exandria | OTTENSMANN | DRAKE <br> Red Wing | HAFFIELD | BETTENDORF |
| 1990 | DRAGISICH | WALKER | MAURER | MOEN | EASTLING <br> Richfield | DRAKE | MCCLURG <br> New Ulm | BETTENDORF |
| 1991 | PRUSAK <br> Cloquet | KILDAHL Crookston | WILLIAMSON Sauk Rapids | MOEN | EASTLING | DRAKE | MCCLURG | SHANSON <br> Willmar |
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| Year | 9 | Mpls. | St. Paul | Duluth | Chairman | Vice | Secretary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | --- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1972 | THENE <br> White Bear Lk. | SORENSON | SCHNARR | davidson | LANGSETH <br> Bloomington |  | CARLSON Willmar |
| 1973 | thene | SORENSON | SCHMARR | davidson | STROJAN Hopkins |  | JOHNSON <br> Albert Lea |
| 1974 | thene | SORENSON | SCHNARR | DAVIDSON | CARLSON Willmar |  | MERILA <br> Brooklyn Park |
| 1975 | thene | SORENSON | SCHNARR | DAVIDSON | JOHNSON <br> Anoka |  | COOK <br> Faribault |
| 1976 | DAVIDSON <br> Inver Gr. Hgts | SORENSON | SCHNARR | davidson | MERILA <br> Brooklyn Park |  | ASMUS <br> Minnetonka |
| 1977 | DAVIDSON | SORENSON | SCHNARR | DAVIDSON | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COOK } \\ & \text { Faribault } \end{aligned}$ | ASMUS <br> Minnetonka | THENE <br> Wt. Br. Lk. |
| 1978 | HONCHELL <br> Roseville | SMITH | WHEELER | DAVIDSON | ASMUS <br> Minnetonka | THENE <br> Wt. Br. Lk. | PRIEBE <br> Hutchinson |
| 1979 | HONCHELL | SMITH | WHEELER | DAVIDSON | PRIEBE <br> Hutchinson | ADEN <br> Marshall | BAKER <br> Mankato |
| 1980 | SIMON <br> S. St. Paul | SMITH | WHEELER | DAVIDSON | ADEN <br> Marshall | BAKER Mankato | HONCHELL <br> Roseville |
| 1981 | KLEINSCHMIDT Inver Gr. Hgts | SMITH | PETERSON | DAVIDSON | BAKER <br> Mankato | HONCHELL <br> Roseville | SIMON <br> S. St. Paul |
| 1982 | KLEINSChmidt | HOSHAW | PETERSON | DAVIDSON | HONCHELL <br> Roseville | SIMON <br> S. St. Paul | REIMER <br> Moorhead |
| 1983 | KLEINSCHMIDT | HOSHAW | PETERSON | DAVIDSON | SIMON <br> S. St. Paul | REIMER <br> Moorhead | SPURRIER <br> Shakopee |
| 1984 | GATLIN <br> White Bear Lk. | HOSHAW | PETERSON | BERG | REIMER <br> Moorhead | SPURRIER <br> Shakopee | ANDERSON <br> Prior Lake |
| 1985 | GATLIN | HOSHAW | PETERSON | CARLSON | SPURRIER <br> Shakopee | ANDERSON <br> Prior Lake | SAFFERT <br> Mankato |
| 1986 | GATLIN | HOSHAW | PETERSON | CARLSON | ANDERSON Prior Lake | SAFFERT Mankato | MOORE <br> Plymouth |
| 1987 | SIGGERUD Burnsville | HOSHAW | KUHFELD | CARLSON | SAFFERT Mankato | MOORE <br> Plymouth | RUDRUD <br> Bloomington |
| 1988 | SIGGERUD | HOSHAW | KUHFELD | CARLSON | MOORE <br> Plymouth | RUDRUD <br> Bloomington | BULLERT Northfield |
| 1989 | SIGGERUD | HOSHAW | KUHFELD | LARSON | RUDRUD <br> Bloomington | BULLERT Northfield | GRUBE <br> St. Louis Park |
| 1990 | HAIDER <br> Maplewood | HOSHAW | KUHFELD | LARSON | BULLERT Northfield | GRUBE <br> St. Louis Park | EDWARDS <br> Fergus Falls |
| 1991 | HAIDER | HOSHAW | KUHFELD | LARSON | GRUBE <br> St. Louis Park | EDWARDS <br> Fergus Falls | ALAN GRAY Eden Prairie |
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StATE OF MINNESOTA
HIGHWAY DISTRICTS AND MUNICIPALITIES AS ESTABLISHED FOR STATE AID PURPOSES


MINUTES
SPRING
MUNICIPAL SCREENING COMMITTEE
JUNE 17-18, 1991

## I. SESSION 1

The spring meeting of the Municipal Screening Board was called to order by Chairman Jim Grube at 1:15 P.M., Monday, June 17, 1991. Roll call was taken by the Secretary.

Present were:
Officers and Municipal Screening Board Members:

Chairman -
Secretary -
District 1 -
District 2 -
District 3 -
District 4 -
District -
Metro West
District 6 -
District 7 -
District 8 -
District -
Metro East
First Class City -
First Class City -
First Class City -
Chairman Needs Study
Subcommittee
Unencumbered
Construction Fund
Subcommittee
Others:
Dennis Carlson
Ken Straus
Ken Hoeschen
Bill Croke
Jack Isaacson
Dave Reed
Tallack Johnson
Chuck Weichselbaum
Earl Welshons
Doug Haeder
John Hoeke
Elmer Morris

Jim Grube
Alan Gray
Jim Prusak
David Kildahl
Sidney Williamson
Alvin Moen
Mike Eastling
Tom Drake
Pete McClurg
Dale Swanson
Kenneth Haider
Kenneth Larson
Marv Hoshaw
Thomas Kuhfeld
Clyde Busby
Bruce Bullert

St. Louis Park
Eden Prairie
Cloquet
Crookston
Sauk Rapids
Alexandria
Richfield
Red Wing
New Ulm
Willmar
Maplewood
Duluth
Minneapolis
St. Paul
Hibbing
Savage

Director, Office of State Aid
Manager, Municipal State Aid Needs
Manager, County State Aid Needs
District 1 State Aid Engineer
District 2 State Aid Engineer
District 3 State Aid Engineer
District 4 State Aid Engineer
Metro West State Aid Engineer
District 6 State Aid Engineer
District 7 State Aid Engineer
District 8 State Aid Engineer
Metro East State Aid Engineer

Romankutty Kannankutty
Dan Sabin
Dave Kreager
Greg Peterson
Leon Pearson
Bo Spurrier
Don Aluni
Sarah Haekett
Bill Bennett
Mayor Wallace Loberg

Minneapolis
Minneapolis
Duluth
St. Paul
St. Paul
Minneapolis
Minneapolis
League of MN Cities
Hermantown
Hermantown

## A. Unit Price Recommendations

Chairman Grube introduced Mr. Ken Straus, Manager, Municipal State Aid Needs. Mr. Straus presented the 1991 Municipal Screening Data Report, dated June, 1991. Straus directed the group's attention to Page 29 which summarizes the 1990 unit price recommendations to the Board. He then highlighted the recommended unit prices which were subject to the greatest change in comparison to 1990 prices.

The Needs Study Subcommittee recommends an adjustment to the calculation of traffic signal cost per mile for each of the three projected traffic categories. The three traffic categories are 0 to 4,999 ADT, 5,000 to 9,999 ADT, and $10,000+$ ADT. The Subcommittee recommends that for each of the three categories, the signal needs be $1 / 2$ signal per mile, 1 signal per mile, and two signals per mile respectively. City signal needs would be based on $1 / 2$ the signal unit price of $\$ 75,000$ assuming that the cross street is a county road or trunk highway. Needs per mile for the three traffic categories are calculated as $\$ 18,750, \$ 37,500$, and $\$ 75,000$ respectively. The affect on apportionment is itemized on Pages 56 through 59. The total signal needs increase by $\$ 23,145,488$. Since total apportionment remains the same, the value of needs drops from $\$ 32.10$ per thousand dollars to $\$ 31.50$ per thousand dollars. As a result, some cities which have an increase in signal needs will receive a decrease in apportionment. The change in apportionment is shown in Column K on Page 56.

The Subcommittee also recommends a price change for railroad grade crossings. It is recommended that signs increase from $\$ 400$ to $\$ 500$, that signals for low speed single track increase from $\$ 75,000$ to $\$ 80,000$, that signals with gates for multiple track high and low speed remain the same at $\$ 110,000$ and that rubberized material per track increase from $\$ 750$ per lineal foot to $\$ 850$ per lineal foot.

This concluded comments by Straus regarding unit price recommendations. Chairman Grube called for comments or questions.

Thomas Kuhfeld (St. Paul) asked if unit prices for bituminous surface materials included oil and asked for background on the recommendation to reduce the unit price for bituminous surface 2361 from $\$ 33.00$ to $\$ 30.00$. The unit price for bituminous surface material includes oil. Straus directed Board members to the chart on Page 49 showing costs data for bituminous surface 2361 from 1981 through 1991. The unit price has been
declining since 1987 and the 1991 average unit price was $\$ 26.22$. The five-year average unit price has been declining since 1988. The 1991 five-year average unit price is $\$ 29.70$. Based on the five-year average, the subcommittee recommends the $\$ 30.00$ unit price.

## B. Annual Maintenance Cost

Straus referred board members to the Needs Subcommittee recommendations for annual maintenance costs on Page 66. The committee recommendation is to hold maintenance costs at the 1990 level. The total maintenance needs cost for 1990 is $\$ 13,041,621$. The average cost per mile is $\$ 6,086$. Maintenance costs were adjusted approximately two years ago. At that time, cities submitted data on maintenance costs indicating the average cost of $\$ 7,500$ per mile.

## C. Unencumbered Construction Funds

Straus directed board members to the minutes of the Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee on Page 69 through 73. The subcommittee recommends a change in the current procedure for adjusting the 25 -year needs based on the unencumbered construction fund balance as of September 1 each year. Currently, the unencumbered construction balance minus the current year's construction apportionment is subtracted from total needs. The subcommittee recommends that the total unencumbered construction balance be subtracted from total needs. This will result in a larger deduction from total needs for all cities with unencumbered construction balances as of September 1 of each year. The committee believes that this change will encourage cities to reduce construction balances.

Straus directed board members to the Table on Pages 74 through 76. This Table lists for each city the effect of the above recommendation on the 1991 needs apportionment. The cities that benefit are those with low unencumbered construction fund balances. These cities show an increase in the apportionment based on needs. Communities with larger unencumbered construction fund balances received larger 25 -year needs deductions and proportionately smaller percentages of the total needs apportionment.

Marv Hoshaw (Minneapolis) requested clarification of the impact on needs apportionment. Straus pointed out that 25 -year total needs are currently adjusted based on unencumbered construction balances. Currently, however, a community who's unencumbered construction balance as of September 1 is less than the current year's construction apportionment receives no deduction to total needs. If the committee recommendation is adopted, all cities with an unencumbered construction balance will receive a deduction from total needs. A city would need a zero balance to avoid a deduction. A city's construction apportionment is then based on the ratio of its adjusted needs to the total adjusted needs of all cities.

## D. Excess Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance

Straus directed board members to the second recommendation of the Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee. This recommendation is outlined on Page 77 of the Municipal Screening Board Data. This recommendation would modify one of the criteria used to determine if a city has an excess unencumbered construction fund balance. Currently, a city has an excess if its construction fund balance as of September 1 exceeds $\$ 300,000$ or two-times its annual construction allotment (whichever is greater). The committee's recommendation is to raise the $\$ 300,000$ ceiling to $\$ 400,000$. Cities with annual construction allotments of less than $\$ 150,000$ are impacted by the $\$ 300,000$ limitation. The cities with construction allotments larger than $\$ 150,000$ are limited by twice their annual construction allotment. The $\$ 300,000$ ceiling was last increased in 1982. At that time 37 cities had annual allotments of less than $\$ 150,000$. Currently 10 cities have allotments of less than $\$ 150,000$ and are affected by the current limitation. If the ceiling is raised to $\$ 400,000,21$ cities would be subject to this limitation. Cities with larger annual allotments have seen an increase in their allowable construction fund balances due to the increase in the total construction allocation. Since 1984 the total construction allotment has increased $59 \%$. Straus further indicated that while the Subcommittee's recommendation, as outlined on Page 77, is to raise the ceiling to $\$ 400,000$ the Subcommittee suggested that the Screening Board may wish to consider a revision to as high as $\$ 500,000$.

Straus then proceeded to outline the third recommendation of the Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee. This recommendation is a change to the other portion of the formula for determining a excess unencumbered construction fund balance. The current resolution states that a city has an excess unencumbered construction fund balance if the fund balance exceeds two-times its annual construction allotment or $\$ 300,000$ (whichever is greater). Cities with annual construction allotments exceeding $\$ 150,000$ are subject to two-times their annual construction allotment in determining an excess fund balance. The formula proposed by the Subcommittee takes total apportionment subtracts $25 \%$ and multiples the remainder by 1.5 . The effect of this formula change is outlined in a Table on Pages 78 through 80 . The Subcommittee recommends this change become effective September 1, 1992.

Straus outlined the example of Albert Lea. Albert Lea's total apportionment for 1991 is $\$ 572,460$. Subtracting $25 \%$ leaves a balance of $\$ 429,345$. When this amount is multiplied by 1.5 to determine the proposed allowable balance, the result is $\$ 644,018$. The present formula of multiplying the annual apportionment by two, results in an allowable balance of $\$ 1,920,390$. Albert Lea's balance as of February 1, 1991 was $\$ 1,617,977$. To avoid an adjustment in needs for an excess unencumbered construction fund balance, Albert Lea would need to reduce their balance by $\$ 973,960$ by September 1,1992 if the proposed formula were in effect. Based on the present formula Albert Lea's February 1 balance is $\$ 20,608$ below the excess unencumbered construction fund balance threshold.

Straus pointed out that the Subcommittee's proposal is designed to encourage cities to further reduce construction fund balances. If the proposal is adopted, cities would need to spend an additional $\$ 38,000,000$ to avoid excess unencumbered construction fund
balance adjustments to needs. If the proposal is adopted together with increasing the minimum allowable balance to $\$ 400,000,49$ cities would be affected by the minimum $\$ 400,000$ allowable balance.

Straus referred board members to a separate handout containing a table showing the affects on each city based on a modified proposal. The modified proposal reduces the total apportionment by $25 \%$ and multiplies the remainder by 2.0 instead of the 1.5 recommended by the Subcommittee. This results in a larger allowable construction fund balance for each city. This table shows that cities would have to reduce construction fund balances by an additional $\$ 11.5$ million when compared to the current formula for determining excess construction fund balance. If this proposal were adopted, together with raising the minimal allowable balance to $\$ 400,000,29$ cities would be affected by the minimal allowable balance.

Straus directed board members to the Table on Page 81 through 84 showing a third formula for calculating allowable construction fund balance. This formula suggested by Straus takes the average construction allotment of a community for the last three years multiplied by 2. Straus pointed out that this method reduces the impact to cities in the event of a drop in construction allotment, which may result when a city requests additional maintenance costs or incurs a drop in population apportionment or money needs apportionment. Straus also pointed out that the addition of four new cities to the State Aid System may result in a general decrease in apportionment for all cities. This will result in reduced allowable construction fund balances for all formulas based on the current years construction allotment. Jim Grube pointed out that the minutes of the Subcommittee recommend a phased implementation of the formula to calculate maximum allowable construction fund balance. The increase from $\$ 300,000$ to $\$ 400,000$ is recommended for implementation September 1, 1991. The other threshold for construction fund balance based on a multiple of apportionment is recommended for implementation September 1, 1992.

Dale Swanson (Willmar) inquired as to the number of construction items which make up the needs computations that are a function of traffic as is shown for traffic signals under unit price recommendations. Ken Straus pointed out that estimated needs quantities are based on the projected pavement width which is a function of traffic. Dale Swanson indicated that while traffic in Willmar had been counted in 1990, MnDOT Central Office was projecting 1993 before adjusted traffic counts were available. Due to staff limitations Central Office indicated that there was not sufficient time available to perform MnDOT traffic count reductions and traffic count reductions for cities and counties. Dennis Carlson (Director, Office of State Aid) indicated that a three-year delay in processing traffic count data was unacceptable and he would confer with the Central Office Traffic Division to see if there was a resolution to this problem.

Straus directed board members to a single page handout which represents a revised excess unencumbered construction fund balance resolution containing Subcommittee recommendations. This resolution shows the change from $\$ 300,000$ to $\$ 400,000$ and the revision from two-times construction allotment to total apportionment times 0.75 times 1.5. Straus then referred board members to another committee recommendation contained in the center of the resolution. This recommendation would add the following
sentences. "When a city has received an adjustment in a previous year due to an excess balance, in the following years the allowable balance shall be computed without that adjustment. The loss in apportionment for that adjustment shall be computed by using the rate that its money needs bears to the total money needs of all other cities." Without this language a city who received a reduced construction allocation due to an excess unencumbered construction fund balance would find their allowable balance further reduced.

The Subcommittee also recommends a modification to the next sentence in the resolution. The change consists of dropping the last four words of the sentence which read, "for the following year", and adding the following phrase, "and make recommendation to the Screening Board." The full sentence will then read: "The Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee shall meet with those cities still having an excess unencumbered construction fund balance after September 1 , of that year and review with them the adjustment which will be made to their 25 -year construction needs and make recommendation to the Screening Board." In 1990 the Screening Board did not concur with several recommendations of the Subcommittee regarding communities excess unencumbered construction fund balances. This was a change from years prior to 1990. The Subcommittee feels that the modified language will provide for a more formalized recommendation to the Board.

Straus pointed out the Subcommittee's recommendation to add the phrase "to the limits specified" into the next to the last sentence of the resolution after its first phrase "unless the balance is reduced". The sentence would then read: "Unless the balance is reduced to the limits specified in future years, this deduction will be increased annually to three, four, five, etc., times the amount until such time the money needs are reduced to zero." The Subcommittee feels the addition clarifies the intent of the sentence. The Subcommittee felt that without the clarification a city could argue that any reduction in its construction balance would forestall an increase in the factor times the construction fund balance to determine the needs adjustment.

Mike Eastling (Richfield) asked if the Subcommittee considered the data contained in the table handed out separately from the Screening Board Date Book which shows the calculation of the allowable balance based on a $25 \%$ deduction from total apportionment and a multiplier of 2.0. Ken Straus explained that the Subcommittee did not have the table showing that calculation for each city. That table was prepared after District meetings in which many city representatives indicated concerns for the impact of the formula proposed by the Subcommittee.

Marv Hoshaw (Minneapolis) requested a clarification of the Subcommittee's request regarding their recommendations to the Screen Board on excess unencumbered construction fund balances. Ken Straus pointed out that the Subcommittee's request was the additional phrase in the resolution which would be added to the sentence describing the Subcommittee's meetings with cities having excess balances. The added phrase at the end of the sentence was "and make recommendations to the Screening Board".

Chairman Grube requested a clarification of the phrase "to the limits specified". Ken Straus indicated that the phrase referred to formulas contained in the resolution for determining an excess unencumbered construction fund balance.

Bruce Bullert (Subcommittee Member, Savage) outlined an additional recommendation of the subcommittee. The Subcommittee noted that if a construction contract is awarded after September 1, but prior to December 31, the value of the contract remains in the unencumbered construction balance for the city, but the street segment is deleted from the needs computation in the next year. The Subcommittee recommends that the date a improved street segment is removed from needs computation correspond to the date the contract value is subtracted from the unencumbered construction balance.

Straus directed board members to the Table on Pages 87 and 88 showing cities with tentative excess unencumbered construction fund balances as of February 1, 1991. Thirty-four cities are included on the Table. Balances will be reviewed again and a second memo will be sent after June 30, 1991.

## E. Hermantown Request

Chairman Grube introduced Mr. Bill Bennett, P.E., of LHB Engineers and Architects who presented the Hermantown request. An outline of the request by Hermantown containing a desired motion to be considered by the Board, together with background data, was presented.

Hermantown's current construction balance is $\$ 1,102,406$. Their 1991 construction allotment is $\$ 114,498$. Hermantown received an excess unencumbered construction fund balance adjustment to needs in 1990. If no reduction to balance is accomplished in 1991 Hermantown would expect a significant adjustment to needs resulting in an estimated loss of $\$ 95,165$ in its 1992 apportionment.

Hermantown has programmed two construction projects for 1991. The Stebner Road reconstruction project was let May 7, 1991 and is to be constructed utilizing a combination of MSA and FAU Funding. MSA eligible costs in the Stebner Road project should reduce the MSA balance to $\$ 623,529$.

Hermantown is preparing to proceed with the Ugstad Road project. The financing for this $\$ 625,000$ requires approximately $\$ 312,000$ of FAU Funds which were originally programmed for this project in 1991, but are currently not available due to over programming in the Duluth/Superior urbanized area. Except for the lack of FAU Funding, Hermantown would proceed in 1991 to award a contract for the Ugstad Road project which should reduce the MSA balance to approximately $\$ 260,000$. Hermantown is requesting an extension of the deadline for contract award of the Ugstad Road project from September 1 to December 31, 1991 for purpose of calculating the excess unencumbered construction fund balance adjustment.

Dennis Carlson (Manager, State Aid Office) asked when Hermantown could be ready for a project letting. Bill Bennett replied that Hermantown expected to complete right-ofway acquisition by September and be ready for a contract letting in October. Carlson
suggested that Hermantown be prepared to proceed with the contract letting at the earliest possible date in the event that excess FAU funds from other districts would be reallocated from the 1991 program later this year. A reallocation of excess FAU funds from other districts might become available as early as August. Carlson also suggested that the 1992 Transportation Funding Bill might set new priorities for the allocation of FAU funds making it more difficult for Hermantown to compete. Hermantown's best chance of receiving FAU funding for the project may be reallocation of 1991 funds.

Bill Bennett indicated that the Ugstad Road project had top priority for FAU funding in their district. Ken Larson (Duluth) confirmed that priority for the project.

## F. Census Data

Straus referred board members to census data shown on Pages 91 through 93. The Table shows 1980 and 1990 census data. Based on the 1990 census data, there would be four new State Aid cities; Cambridge, Sartell, Waite Park, and Mahtomedi. Monticello may also become a State Aid city depending on the resolution of certain issues regarding their 1990 census data.

The 1990 data also indicates that two current State Aid cities; Redwood Falls and Eveleth may have populations below 5,000 and will drop out of the State Aid system.

Straus pointed out that Bloomington is now the third largest city in the State.
Straus also referred Board members to the Table on Pages 94 through 96. This Table shows the affect of the 1990 census data on 1991 apportionment. If the 1990 census data were used for 1991 apportionment, the per capita allocation would be $\$ 14.19$ vs the $\$ 15.55$ allocation derived using 1980 census data. If the 1990 census data were used, the affect on apportionment is shown in the far right-hand column of the Table.

## G. Combination Routes

Straus referred board members to a discussion on combination routes contained in the minutes of the Municipal State Aid Needs Study Subcommittee on Page 28, and to a separate handout entitled Expenditures on Combination Routes in Crystal. The Subcommittee noted that combination routes are of no advantage to the city and that they tend to reduce overall MSA needs. The Subcommittee recommends that all cities remove combination routes by the end of 1993. To encourage compliance the Subcommittee further recommends that there be no adjustment to needs for routes already removed, nor an adjustment to needs for combination routes removed before the end of 1993. For combination routes removed after 1993, the Subcommittee recommends a ten-year adjustment of needs based on remaining life of the roadway.

## H. Urban and Rural Design Standard Changes

Straus directed Board members to an additional recommendation of the Needs Study Subcommittee on Page 28. The Subcommittee recommends that the design quantities for various volume roadways should continue to based on the current State Aid Urban and

Rural Design Standards rather than the new width standards. The Subcommittee feels that the current design standards are more desirable than the new minimum design standards. Jim Grube (St. Louis Park) asked if the Screening Board would need to take specific action on this recommendation of the Needs Study Subcommittee. After considerable discussion, it was concluded that if the Board wished to support the recommendation of the Subcommittee, no action was required.

## I. Allocation Subcommittee Study

Chairman Grube introduced Bruce Bullert (Savage), Chairman of the Allocation Study Subcommittee. The Subcommittee was created to evaluate methods of allocation State Aid Funds. Bullert reviewed the 1991 Allocation Subcommittee Study.

A Table titled "Comparison of Total Appropriations", contained in the Subcommittee report, shows the projected allocations for fourteen different methods based on projected 1992 total apportionment of $\$ 79,773,732$ and 1990 census figures. There are two appropriation tables contained in the report. Each table contains the same data for each of the allocation methods. The table labeled Study 15 contains the appropriations for every State Aid city for each of the fourteen appropriation formulas tested. The table labeled Study 12 reports the data for each State Aid city and each allocation method, except the data is blank where the variation from the current appropriation method is less than $10 \% \pm$. The table labeled Study 15 gives a quick reference to those cities whose allocation would vary more than $10 \%$ under each of the allocation formulas.

Bruce Bullert called the board members attention to the Subcommittee's recommendation on Page 1A of their report. The Subcommittee prefers the existing apportionment method based on population and needs for the MSA system. If a change were to be made, however, the Subcommittee would prefer that $25 \%$ of total apportionment dollars be distributed for maintenance purposes based on lane miles. The remaining $75 \%$ of total apportionment would be distributed based on the current system, i.e., $50 \%$ on population and $50 \%$ based on needs.

Chairman Grube reminded board members that the State Legislature continues to have a strong interest in the apportionment of MSA funds primarily due to the large unencumbered construction fund balance. The Legislature's interest is heightened by the lack of money available in the general fund. In conclusion, Jim Grube pointed out that the Subcommittee report can serve as a continuing reference for evaluation of alternate appropriation methods that may be proposed.

Marv Hoshaw commended the Subcommittee on the preparation of an excellent report.

## J. Legal Fees and Appraisal Costs

Chairman Grube directed board members attention to the June 17, 1991 letter from the City Engineers Association to Municipal State Aid Screening Committee. The letter transmit the recommendation of the City Engineers Association considered approved at
their June 13, 1991 summer meeting, favoring the eligibility of legal fees and appraisal fees for reimbursement as MSA costs. Chairman Grube proposed that this recommendation be discussed in detail during the evening session of the Board.

## K. Old Business/New Business

Chairman Grube called for old business or new business to be discussed by the Board. No old or new business was presented for discussion.

## L. Lino Lakes Excess Unencumbered Construction Funds

Straus referred board members to a letter dated June 12, 1991 from SEH Engineers Architects and Planners regarding Lino Lakes. The combination of city assessment policy and restrictions due to a home rule charter, make it very difficult for Lino Lakes to proceed with MSA projects in the face of any adjacent property owner opposition. The letter requests that the Board consider exempting Lino Lakes from a needs reduction based on an excess unencumbered construction fund balance. There was no further discussion of the Lino Lakes request.

Chairman Grube declared the session official adjourned until 8:30 a.m., June 18, 1991. Chairman Grube also advised Board members that an informal session would convene at 8:00 p.m., June 17 to discuss topics raised at this session.

## II. EVENING SESSION

Chairman Grube called the informal session to order at $8: 25$ p.m. He noted that no action would be taken tonight on the issues discussed. The session is for gathering facts, hearing ideas and encouraging all members to express their opinions on the issues before the Screening Board.

## A. Hermantown Request

Board members discussed the request of Hermantown as outlined in the June 14, 1991 letter from LHB Engineers and Architects. It was noted that right-of-way was probably the critical path to preparing the Ugstad Road project for letting. There is the possibility that FAU funds might be available in August or September to allow Hermantown to proceed with this project. Board members expressed concern for the complexities and uncertainties of FAU funding when combined with MSA funding. Developing projects with a combination of FAU and MSA funds may jeopardize schedules critical to reducing unencumbered construction fund balances. Board members noted that Hermantown has taken positive steps in developing a five-year plan.

The Ugstad Road project, being approximately $1 / 2$ mile in length and costing approximately $\$ 625,000$, is a relatively efficient sized project for a city. Cities with small annual apportionments, however, will find difficulty in developing projects of this size and still avoiding excess unencumbered construction fund balance adjustments to needs.

## B. Lino Lakes Request

Concern was expressed that communities with similar charter restrictions may be unable to fund utility rehabilitation costs through assessments or general tax dollars on MSA projects. It was suggested that Lino Lakes consider public education and possibly charter revisions to remove or reduce the restrictions to improvement projects utilizing MSA funds, assessments, or general tax dollars. Many older cities may have similar problems to Lino Lakes. It was also noted that requesting higher maintenance allotments may have eliminated their excess unencumbered balance for 1991.

## C. Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee Recommendations

Board members discussed the recommendations of the Subcommittee at considerable length. It was agreed that the total unencumbered construction fund balance was an image problem with the State Legislature. As a result it was important for the Board to consider implementing policy to encourage cities to reduce their fund balances. The current policies may penalize a few cities but have little effect on the total bottom line. Board members also expressed concern that changing the formula to determine excess unencumbered construction fund balance may have unanticipated affects that will be regretted in the future.

## D. Needs Allocation Study

Due to the number of alternative apportionment methods studied and to the wide variance in effects on individual communities, additional time is needed to fully evaluate the report. It was noted that the Subcommittee recommendation is to retain the current method of apportionment. The Subcommittee's second recommendation was outlined in Column N of the Composite Table contained in the report.

## E. League of Minnesota Cities Viewpoint

Sarah Haekell of the League of Minnesota Cities presented the League's views. Cities must reduce their unencumbered construction fund balances. State Legislatures view the large balance in the Municipal State Aid account as an indication that cities do not need additional State help. This supports legislators decisions to reduce local government aid.

The Transportation Bill includes a three-year advance provision which should help cities to reduce balances and keep them low. The concept of one city loaning allocation to another did not receive support in the Legislature.

The League is working to increase State Legislators awareness of local transportation issues. It is critically important for cities to maintain contact with State Legislatures and to present a unified portion on transportation issues.

## F. Combination Routes

The recommendation of the Needs Study Subcommittee to allow cities to remove combination routes from their MSA system without an adjustment of needs, was generally supported by Board members. Some members felt that the amnesty period extending to the end of 1993 for removal without needs adjustment may be an issue.

Chairman Grube adjourned the evening session at 11:15 p.m.

## III. SESSION 2

The spring meeting of the Municipal Screening Board was called back into session at 8:30 a.m., June 18, 1991, by Chairman Jim Grube. Roll call was taken and the list of attendees was the same as the June 17, 1991 session.
A. Approval of Minutes

Chairman Grube called for the consideration and approval of the minutes of the October 29-30, 1990 Municipal Screening Board meeting. The minutes are contained on Pages 4 through 23 of the 1991 Municipal Screening Board Data.

Motion: by Tom Drake, second by Sid Williamson to approve minutes.
Discussion: None
Action: Motion Approved

## B. Unit Price Recommendations

Chairman Grube called for consideration of the 1991 unit price recommendations found on Page 29 of Municipal Screening Board Data. Tom Drake asked if a separate motion would be required for signals. Ken Straus indicated that a separate motion was not required since the proposed adjustment to unit prices for signals is included in the data on Page 29. Ken Straus referred board members to the Table on Pages 56-59. Column K of the Table shows the affect on apportionment that the proposed signal prices will have for each city.

Motion: by Tom Drake, Second by Sid Williamson to approve 1991 unit price recommendations.

Discussion: Marv Hoshaw noted that the proposed unit price recommendation should result in an increase in needs.

Action: Motion Approved

## C. Unencumbered construction balance deduction.

Chairman Grube called for consideration of the Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee recommendations as contained in the Subcommittee minutes on Page 69. The Subcommittee recommends that a city's total unencumbered construction fund balance, as of September 1, be deducted from the 25 -year needs and that this recommendation become effective September 1, 1992. The Table on Pages 74 through 76 shows the impact of the recommendation on apportionment for each city.

For clarification, Ken Straus referred Board members to the current resolution on Page 106. The current resolution defines the adjustment to needs as "The unencumbered construction fund balance, as of September 1 of the current year, not including the current year construction apportionment". The recommended would delete the phrase "not including the current year construction apportionment". This proposal would increase the needs deduction for every city unless their balance is zero.

Tom Drake observed that the proposal is meant as an incentive to encourage cities to reduce their unencumbered construction fund balances. Many cities may be limited by a lack of manpower resources to accomplish this. It is questionable if this incentive will work to reduce the unencumbered balance.

Chairman Grube observed that the proposal would affect every participating city. Jim Prusak observed that the proposal conveys the appearance that cities have fewer needs. Marv Hoshaw noted that this appears to be just another proposal to reduce needs.

Chairman Grube directed Board members attention to the far right hand column of the Table on Page 74 through 76 indicating the increase or decrease in apportionment for each city based on the proposal. He noted that in most cases the decrease in apportionment for cities with the higher than average unencumbered construction fund balances was only a few thousand dollars. In the case of St. Louis Park the estimate is $\$ 15,000$. The problems associated with a $\$ 15,000$ reduction in apportionment are insignificant compared to the problems associated with accelerating another State Aid Project.

Dennis Carlson suggested that cities use the threat of reduced allocations as a sales tool to convince their councils to accelerate projects. A city council may be willing to budget for an additional staff person to accomplish an additional project and avoid a reduction in apportionment. Marv Hoshaw noted that even the $\$ 29,000$ decrease in apportionment for Minneapolis would not add a staff person to the Public Works Department.

Marv Hoshaw noted that a portion of cities unencumbered balances is reimbursement for construction engineering which is awaiting final project audit before it is reimbursed to the city. This can take as long as three years. For larger cities this could amount to $\$ 1,000,000$. Marv Hoshaw also noted that construction engineering costs regularly exceed the MSA allowable percentage.

Motion: by Marv Hoshaw to send proposal back to Subcommittee with recommendation to find an incentive that results in reduced allocation without a reduction in needs.

Action: $\quad$ Motion dies for lack of second.
Mike Eastling felt that the adjustment to annual allotment, based on unencumbered construction fund balance, should somehow be adjusted after needs are determined allowing a community to report its full needs. Tom Kuhfeld pointed out that reporting total needs and not spending allocations tends to present an inflated needs picture. What should be done is to remove some of the hurdles to spending.

Chairman Grube stated that it was more important to keep the reported needs high than to build in the proposed incentive for cities to reduce needs. This proposed incentive is not sufficient to cause cities to accelerate major expenditures. Ken Straus pointed out that if the Board decided to eliminate the current resolution needs reporting could increase by $\$ 57$ million.

Motion: by Tom Drake, Second by Dale Swanson to approve recommendation of Subcommittee subject to retaining the reporting of total needs.

Discussion: Ken Straus indicated that it would be better to report basic needs than adjusted needs. Marv Hoshaw felt that while the proposal is a move in the right direction, it is not worth doing.

Action: Chairman Grube called for a voice vote which was indeterminate. Chairman Grube called for a hand ballot of those in favor and those opposed. There were six in favor and six opposed. Chairman Grube declared the motion dead.

There was discussion of the rules regarding the Chairman authority to vote on a motion. Ken Straus referred Board members to the resolution on Page 98 referring to the appointment of the Board Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The resolution states that neither the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman may vote on Board matters unless they are also the duly appointed Screening Board representative of a Construction District or City of the First Class. Chairman Grube called for additional discussion or a substitute motion.

Motion: by Marv Hoshaw, Second by Tom Drake to refer the recommendation back to the Subcommittee with direction to improve the incentives without reducing reported needs.

Discussion: Jim Prusak pointed out that the Subcommittee's recommendation is to make the change effective September 1, 1992. There is additional time for the Board to consider this recommendation and still make it effective at that date.

Action: Motion Approved.
D. Excess Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance.

1. Limit of $\$ 300,000$.

Chairman Grube referred Board members to the Subcommittee recommendation found in the middle of Page 70. The Subcommittee recommends that the $\$ 300,000$ limit be increased to $\$ 400,000$. Chairman Grube also referred Board members to background data found on Page 77 indicating that total construction allotment has increased approximately $60 \%$ since 1984 and there has been no adjustment to the $\$ 300,000$ level since 1982 . The increase to $\$ 400,000$ would represent a $33 \%$ increase.

Motion: by Marv Hoshaw, Second by Dale Swanson to approve Subcommittee recommendation increasing limit to $\$ 400,000$ effective September 1, 1991.

Discussion: Dennis Carlson suggested that the measurable effect of this motion to the unencumbered construction fund balance may be approximately $\$ 2,000,000$.

Motion: by Tom Drake, Second by Mike Eastling to amend motion increasing the threshold to $\$ 500,000$ effective September 1, 1991.

Discussion: Mike Eastling noted that none of the Board members were from cities affected by the proposed resolution change.

Action: Amendment to Motion Passed.
Action: Chairman Grube called for a vote on the amended motion to increase the limit to $\$ 500,000$, effective September 1, 1991. Motion passed.
2. Limit as a Function of Allocation.

Chairman Grube called for consideration of the Subcommittee's recommendation to modify the excess unencumbered balance determination as a function of annual allocation. The current resolution defines an excess unencumbered construction fund balance as two times a city's annual allotment. The Subcommittee recommends the definition be changed to the annual allotment times .75 times 1.5. The recommendation is listed on Page 70, the effects of the recommendation are shown in table form on Pages 74 through 76. Board members were also directed to tables showing two alternate methods for their consideration. The first alternate proposal is annual allotment times .75 times 2.0 . The second alternate is a community's three-year average annual allotment times 2.0.

Ken Larson presented an analysis of the current formula as well as the three formulas being considered. The total allowable fund balance for the current formula which uses two-times a city's annual allotment, is $\$ 134,000,000$. For the Subcommittee recommendation utilizing annual allotment times .75 times 1.5 ,
the maximum fund balance is $\$ 90$ million. For the option of using annual allotment times .75 times 2.0 , the maximum fund balance is $\$ 122$ million. For the option utilizing the three-year average allotment times 2.0 , the maximum fund balance is $\$ 135,000,000$. The Subcommittee recommendation is the most restrictive option.

Marv Hoshaw expressed an objection to the Subcommittee proposal which begins by subtracting $25 \%$ of the annual allocation. Most cities are taking considerably less for maintenance. Ken Straus indicated that only about $25 \%$ of cities take the maximum allowable for maintenance.

Dennis Carlson indicated that the basis for the Subcommittee recommendation may not be as important as the results. He reminded Board members that it is important to reduce the unencumbered construction fund balance. The Subcommittee recommendation, being the most restrictive, would provide the most encouragement to cities to reduce their fund balances.

Mike Eastling expressed concern for the Subcommittee recommendation. This proposal may be a severe hardship for a few cities that would see their adjustment to needs begin to escalate in the second and third year if there were unable to reduce their fund balance. He suggested that the adjustment to needs based on an excess unencumbered construction fund balance would be calculated based on two-year old dollars being multiplied by two, three-year old dollars being multiplied by three, etc.

Marv Hoshaw observed that the excess unencumbered fund balance adjustment has been effective since its implementation several years ago in encouraging cities to reduce their fund balances. Mike Eastling noted that while there are fewer cities whose annual allotments have accumulated for several years, there has been little effect on the total fund balance for all cities. The excess unencumbered construction fund resolution tends to "beat up on a few cities". The Subcommittee's recommendation would result in needs adjustments for almost every city that allowed their annual allotment to accumulate for two years.

Bruce Bullert noted the Subcommittee believes that their proposal would result in a significant reduction in the fund balance. It will take a little time for cities to adjust, but the fund balance will be reduced.

Ken Larson recommended a more overall approach. He noted that the Subcommittee proposal would likely result in a significant increase of cities with excess balances.

Dale Swanson observed that most cities will work to keep their fund balances below the excess level. If the Board truly wants to see the total fund balance lower in the future, the allowable balance has to be reduced. The Subcommittee recommendation would do just that.

Chairman Grube suggested delaying the effective day of the proposed resolution to allow cities additional time to reduce their fund balances. Tom Drake suggested that the more restrictive formula be implemented in a series of steps. Marv Hoshaw echoed this recommendation and compared it to the procedure used for storm sewer needs. He suggested implementing it over a three-year period. Bruce Bullert indicated that the Subcommittee would accept a implementation plan over several years.

Dennis Carlson noted that most board member's comments reflected a system that would treat all cities equally. That in general board members supported a system that would reduce unencumbered construction funds to 1.5 times annual allocation. This will be a difficult criteria for large cities to meet. The previous motion seems inconsistent in that it allows all cities with low annual allotments to accumulate several years and remain below the $\$ 500,000$ limit. Ken Straus stated that the $\$ 500,000$ limit was practical because it is difficult to develop project of $\$ 100,000$ to $\$ 200,000$.

Tom Kuhfeld noted that it takes seven to ten years for major projects from preliminary planning to completion of construction. Cities will find it difficult in reacting to the proposed change by accelerating major projects. Marv Hoshaw noted that if legislature were to appropriate significantly more dollars for State Aid, there is enough red tape out there that it would take five years to bring the additional projects that would receive funding on line for construction.

Dennis Carlson believes that the revised construction standards for State Aid will result in fewer variance requests. In the metro area with the largest State Aid allotments, projects will be easier to complete. This should help to reduce the unencumbered balance.

Motion: by Dale Swanson, Second by Sid Williamson to adopted the Subcommittee recommendation effective in three years (September 1, 1994).

Discussion: Marv Hoshaw recommended a friendly amendment deleting any reference to maintenance and stating the formula as total allotment times 1.125. This friendly amendment was accepted by Dale Swanson and Sid Williamson.

Ken Larson suggested the board continue to look at other methods to reduce the fund balance since he believes that this proposed change would not be affective. Dave Kildahl asked if the current motion includes deducting the current year allotment from the construction fund balance. Ken Straus indicated that it did not.

Mike Eastling asked to clarify that the proposed resolution retains the procedures by which a city may request special consideration of their unencumbered construction fund balance. Ken Straus confirmed that the procedures of notification, meeting with the Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee
and requesting special consideration by the Screening Board are retained. Marv Hoshaw pointed out that raising the other element of the limit to $\$ 500,000$ should help to reduce the number of cities that find themselves with excess unencumbered construction balances.

Action: Chairman Grube called for a vote on the motion. The motion modifies the first sentence of the excess unencumbered construction fund balance resolution to read as follows: "Whenever a municipality's construction fund balance available as of February 1 of the current year exceeds $\$ 500,000$ or 1.125 times their annual construction apportionment (whichever is greater), it shall be considered an excess balance. The State Aid Office will notify the city in writing by March 1 of this excess balance and outline the financial impact to the city if this unencumbered construction fund balance is not reduced to the stated amount by September 1, of that year". Change is to be effective September 1, 1994. Motion approved.

Motion: by Mike Eastling, Second by Pete McClurg, that the Subcommittee study and make recommendation to the Board regarding the excess unencumbered construction balance needs adjustment computation in the first year and subsequent successive years.

Action: Motion Approved

## F. Construction Cutoff Date.

Chairman Grube called for Board consideration of the Subcommittee recommendation to coordinate the construction cut-off date for the determination of needs with the date used for determination of the unencumbered construction fund balance determination.

Motion: by Tom Drake to leave current dates on changed.
Action: Motion died for lack of second.

Chairman Grube noted that the previous motion by Tom Drake did not support the recommendation of the Subcommittee. He again called for a motion. No motion was made. Chairman Grube noted that the dates will remain as they are now stipulated in current Board resolutions.

## G. Excess Unencumbered Construction Fund Language.

Chairman Grube referred Board members to the language changes recommended by the Subcommittee to the excess unencumbered construction fund balance resolution. The changes are shown on a handout to the Board.

The first change adds a new sentence to the resolution. The sentences added after the second sentence in the current resolution which ends with the phrase "of that same year". The new sentence would read: "When a city had received an adjustment in a previous year due to an excess balance, in the following years the allowable balance shall be computed without that adjustment. The loss in apportionment for that adjustment shall be computed by using the rate that its money needs compares to the total money needs of all other cities."

Motion: Motion by David Kildahl, Second by Dale Swanson to approve Subcommittee recommendation adding new sentences to Excess Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance Resolution.

Action: Motion approved.
Chairman Grube referred board members to the second language change recommended by the Subcommittee in the resolution. This language change modifies the current third sentence in the resolution. That sentence now reads: "The Unencumbered Construction Subcommittee shall meet with those cities still having an excess unencumbered construction fund balance after September 1 of that year and inform them of the adjustment that will be made to their 25 -year construction needs for the following year". The sentence proposed by the Subcommittee will read: "The Unencumbered Construction Subcommittee shall meet with those cities still having an excess unencumbered construction fund balance after September 1 of that year and inform them of the adjustment which will be made to their 25 -year construction needs and make recommendation to the Screening Board."

Motion: by Alvin Moen to approve Subcommittee language revision. Motion died for lack of Second.

Motion: by Mike Eastling, Second by Tom Drake to revise the sentence to read, "The Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee shall meet with those cities still having an excess unencumbered construction fund balance after September 1, review with them the proposed adjustment to their 25year construction needs and make recommendation to the Screening Board".
Action: Motion Approved
Chairman Grube directed board members to the change recommended by the Subcommittee to the second to last sentence of the resolution. The change recommended by the Subcommittee adds the phrase "to the limits specified", after the first phrase of the sentence which reads, "unless the balance is reduced".

Motion: by Dale Swanson, Second by Mike Eastling to revise the second to the last sentence of the resolution to read, "Unless the balance is reduced to the limits specified above in future years, this deduction will be increased annually to three, four, five, etc., times the amount until such time the money needs are reduced to zero."

Action: $\quad$ Motion passed.

## H. Lino Lakes Request.

Chairman Grube directed board members to the request of Lino Lakes for an exemption from an excess unencumbered construction fund balance adjustment. The request is outlined in a letter from SEH to Ken Straus. Chairman Grube questioned if changes to the excess unencumbered construction fund resolution, adopted today, would impact the needs adjustment for Lino Lakes for 1992 apportionment. Ken Straus indicated they would not because they are affected by the 2.0 factor.

No motion was presented regarding the Lino Lakes request. Ken Straus indicated that a motion was unnecessary unless the Board wished to provide some exception to Lino Lakes from a needs adjustment in 1992. That adjustment to needs for 1992 apportionment would be in accordance with the resolution as amended today.

## I. Hermantown Request.

Chairman Grube referred board members to the request by the City of Hermantown for an exemption from a needs adjustment due to an excess unencumbered construction fund balance in 1992. Their request is outlined in a letter from LHB Engineers and Architects dated June 14, 1991. Chairman Grube further noted that with the change in the excess unencumbered construction fund limit to $\$ 500,000$, Hermantown would be very close to avoiding the adjustment considering the award of the Stebner Road project.

Bill Bennett, LHB Engineers and Architects, indicated that with the award of the Stebner Road project, Hermantown would be within $\$ 10,000$ of avoiding an excess unencumbered construction fund balance this year. Based on that Hermantown withdraws its request for further consideration by the Board at this time and thanks the Board for their consideration.

## J. Combination Routes.

Chairman Grube referred Board members to the recommendation of the Needs Study Subcommittee on Page 28 regarding combination routes.

The first recommendation of the Subcommittee is that the Screening Board publicize the importance of moving combination routes. Mike Eastling noted that combination routes represent less than $1 \%$ of the total MSA system. Marv Hoshaw suggested that the Board recognize the recommendation of the Subcommittee and direct the Chairman to send a communication to each community with combination routes, recommending their
removal.
Chairman Grube directed board members to the second Subcommittee recommendation regarding combination routes. The Subcommittee recommends that there be a ten-year adjustment of needs based on the remaining life of the roadway for combination routes removed after the end of 1993. This recommendation includes after-the-fact needs for right-of-way. There was considerable discussion among Board members as to whether there was currently an adjustment of needs for combination routes that were removed. Ken Straus and Chuck Weichselbaum advised board members that there is not currently a provision for an adjustment when a combination route is removed. The Board took no action on this recommendation of the Subcommittee.

## K. Urban-Rural Design Standard Changes.

Chairman Grube directed board members to the Needs Study Subcommittee's recommendation regarding urban-rural design standard changes. The Subcommittee recommends that the Table of Quantities used to calculate needs continue to be based on the old design standards.

Tom Drake pointed out that some cities have recently received variances to the old design standards that may result in needs adjustments. He questioned whether those should be reconsidered in light of the new design standards. Dennis Carlson suggested that the question of needs computation and variances be deferred to the fall Screen Board meeting. The Board took no further action on this item.
L. Legal, Appraisal, Environmental and other Administrative Fees.

Chairman Grube directed Board members to the June 17, 1991 letter from CEAM to the Screening Board. The letter outlines CEAM's recommendation that the Screening Board support the eligibility of legal fees and appraisal fees relative to acquisition of right-ofway for MSA projects separately and in addition to design engineering and construction engineering cost. Chairman Grube suggested that the Board further consider environmental cost and other administrative costs in addition to legal and appraisal fees for right-of-way acquisition as eligible for reimbursement.

Tom Kuhfeld noted that cities often have significant front-end costs for environmental assessments and preliminary engineering that are not eligible for MSA participation. If those costs were subtracted from the current unencumbered construction fund balance, the balance would be significantly lower. He suggested that the Board consider not only what is eligible but when it is eligible for reimbursement. Dennis Carlson agreed with Thomas Kuhfeld's observation, but observed that considerable discussion was needed in this area and that it would be necessary to carefully avoid going beyond the intent of the law. Marv Hoshaw suggested to the Board members that the intent of the MSA system was to assist cities with developing their system, but not necessarily pay $100 \%$ of the cost of that system. The Board took no action with regard to this item.

## M. Allocation Subcommittee Study.

Chairman Grube directed board members attention to the 1991 Allocation Subcommittee Study and called for discussion or comments. Marv Hoshaw suggested that an executive summary of the study be prepared in a brochure format that could be sent out. Chairman Grube reminded Board members that if there are additional comments they should be submitted to the Subcommittee by August, 1991. Ken Larson suggested that the Subcommittee consider the introduction of a pavement management system into the allocation formula. Marv Hoshaw noted that the Allocation Subcommittee Study represented many hours of very hard work by the Subcommittee members and MnDOT staff that participated. He acknowledged the Board's appreciation to all the participants involved in preparing this excellent document. Bruce Bullert, Committee Chair, extended his appreciation to all Subcommittee members for their commitment of time, talent and energy in the preparation of the Study.

## N. County Highway Engineers Trade Show.

Chairman Grube directed board member's attention to a preliminary draft of a brochure for the 1991 Minnesota County Highway Engineers Association Conference and Trade Show to be held December 12 and 13, 1991, at the Radisson South in Bloomington. Conference sessions will cover road design, fleet management, sign inventory, pavement management, field inventory, etc. Vendor exhibits will cover surveying instruments, GIS systems, pavement management, sign inventory, geotechnical information, etc.

## O. MSA Bulletin Board.

Dale Swanson suggested that the State Aid Office consider installing an 800 -number connected to the bulletin board to enhance access for outstate cities. Dennis Carlson indicated that the State Aid Office has an out-bound 800 -number. He would check into the feasibility of an in-bound 800 -number connected to the bulletin board.

## P. Acknowledgement of Subcommittee Efforts.

On behalf of the Municipal Screening Board, Chairman Grube extended thanks to Clyde Busby, Chairman of the Needs Study Subcommittee, to Fred Moore, Chairman of the Unencumbered Construction Funds Subcommittee, to Bruce Bullert, Chairman of the Allocation Study Subcommittee, and to all Subcommittee members for their diligent efforts this past year.

## Q. State Aid Report.

Chairman Grube introduced Dennis Carlson, Director Office of State Aid. Mr. Carlson highlighted recent legislation. There is a new wetland conservation bill that provides for permanent preservation of wetlands. Wetland owners may be compensated for up to $50 \%$ of the value of agricultural land for wetlands placed in the preservation program. The value is to be determined by the Department of Revenue and the land owner can avoid taxation on the wetland. Eight years is required to remove a wetland from the
preservation program. Non agricultural wetlands must be replaced at a $2: 1$ ratio except where the encroachment is for a public transportation project. Agricultural wetland replacement is at a $1: 1$ ratio.

The DNR is proposing to take over the Section 404 permit process from the CEO.
A new bill contains water retention measures for townships. If a bridge replacement project includes water retention measures by reducing hydraulic capacity and the resulting project is less expensive than the bridge replacement with full hydraulic capacity, bridge money may be used for approach work and bridge replacement up to the cost estimated for the bridge replacement with the full hydraulic capacity.

The Transportation Study Board Bill created the natural preservation route. The MSA Office will be evaluating possible rules and changes to be consistent with this legislation.

Cities can now program larger projects using three years of allocation.
The Transportation Study Board Bill allows bridge bonding funds to be applied to approach work for water retention projects similar to the legislation for town bridge account funds.

Advanced funding is permitted by cities and counties on Trunk Highway projects provided the project is programmed.

Park roads will be allowed to use lower standards within park boundaries. Park Boards are now authorized to establish lower speed limits on park roads. These speed reductions may not be more than 15 MPH and the speed may not be posted below 20 MPH . This change is significant because the Commissioner of Transportation is no longer the sole authority in establishing speed limits.

Rustic Road is a newly established classification. A designated rustic road cannot be on the State Aid system. No State Transportation funds can be spent on a rustic road.

The Transportation Services fund has been reduced to $\$ 290,000$.
Forest roads can be funded with unrefunded tax money. The legislature reduced the amount available, but since the fund grows, the account should get back to its previous balance.

State Law now sets state agency permit fees not to exceed $\$ 100$.
Research funding is established as $1 \%$ of MnDOT's portion of the highway user tax, and of that, $\$ 800,000$ is specified for the center of transportation studies at the University of Minnesota.

In 1980, several cities dropped below the 5,000 population and were deleted from the MSA System. Legislation adopted in 1982 allowed the transfer of their MSA routes to
the CSAR System with an exemption from the 30,000 mile limit. The same legislation was considered this year for those cities expected to drop below 5,000 in population based on the 1990 census. However, the legislature could not agree on the issue and the legislation was not adopted. Those cities will not have to seek approval from the County Screening Board for the transfer of those routes and they will be subject to the 30,000 mile limit.

The State Legislature created a traffic signal and signing authorization program with $\$ 375,000$ in initial funding. MnDOT Traffic Division has requested a city engineer and county engineer to participate on a task force to establish criteria for expenditure of these funds.

City engineers should be aware of the bridge scour program. The first phase which must be complete by March 31, 1992, is a screening phase to review all bridges for the purpose of classifying those which may be subject to scour. There will be a mailing soon that will explain the guidelines and attempt to remove confusion that exists with these programs.

In the near future all cities will have access to the State Financial Data Base to be able to track the status of their MSA account.

The bridge inventory program is now on the computer. Mat Lang has designed the program so that the user can move vertically within the menu for a specific bridge and horizontally from bridge to bridge at any point in the menu. This adds a lot of flexibility to working with the bridge inventory program.

## R. New Business/Old Business.

Chairman Grube called for new business or old business to be brought before the Board. Jim Prusak requested that the State Aid Office redo the Excess Unencumbered Balance Adjustment Table on Pages 78 through 80, utilizing the formula as adopted ( 1.125 times total apportionment) and include with the data for the fall Screening Board meeting.

Chairman Grube acknowledged Earl Welshons for his many years of service to the Board as District 6th State Aid Engineer and wished him well on his pending retirement.

## S. Adjournment.

Chairman Grube declared the spring 1991 session of the Municipal Screening Board officially adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,


## M.S.A.S., NEEDS, MILEAGE, AND APPORTIONMENT

The amount that is to be apportioned in January is unknown at this time so an estimated amount of $\$ 82,000,000$ is used in this report. This approximate amount reflects an increase since the last apportionment due to the expected increase in the Highway Users Tax revenue and a higher interest amount than forecast earlier in the preceding biennium. The actual amount will be announced in January 1992 when the Commissioner of Transportation makes a determination of the 1992 apportionment.

The estimated Maintenance and Construction amounts are not computed in this booklet due to the city option of receiving a minimum of $\$ 1,500$ per mile or a maximum of $35 \%$ of their allocation for Maintenance. If a city desires to receive more than the minimum, the city has to inform the state Aid office prior to December 16 of their intention.

The continuous increase in M.S.A.S. mileage is due to the increase in the total improved local street mileage of which 20\% is allowed for M.S.A. street designation and the number of cities over 5,000 population.

Recent legislation revised the allowable maximum Municipal State Aid mileage from 2,500 to 3,000 miles.

## M.S.A.S. Mileage, Needs and Apportionment 1958 to 1992

| Appt. Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NuMBER OF } \\ & \text { MUNICIPALITIES } \end{aligned}$ | Mileage | Actual CONST Needs | APPORTIONMENT | Accumulative Apportionment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1958 | 58 | 920.40 | \$190,373,337 | \$7,286,074 | \$7,286,074 |
| 1959 | 59 | 938.36 | 195,749,800 | 8,108,428 | 15,394,502 |
| 1960 | 59 | 968.82 | 197,971,488 | 8,370,596 | 23,765,098 |
| 1961 | 77 | 1131.78 | 233,276,540 | 9,185;862 | 32,950,960 |
| 1962 | 77 | 1140.83 | 223,014,549 | 9,037,698 | 41,988, 658 |
| 1963 | 77 | 1161.06 | 221,458,428 | 9,451,125 | 51, 439,783 |
| 1964 | 77 | 1177.11 | 218,487,546 | 10,967,128 | 62, 406, 911 |
| 1965 | 77 | 1208.81 | 218,760,538 | 11,370,240 | 73,777,151 |
| 1966 | 80 | 1271.87 | 221,992,032 | 11,662,274 | 85, 439, 425 |
| 1967 | 80 | 1309.93 | 212,065,299 | 12,442,900 | 97, 882, 325 |
| 1968 | 84 | 1372.36 | 214,086,481 | 14,287,775 | 112,170,100 |
| 1969 | 85 | 1405.35 | 209,186,115 | 15,121,277 | 127,291,377 |
| 1970 | 86 | 1427.59 | 205,103,981 | 16,490,064 | 143,781,441 |
| 1971 | 85 | 1427.41 | 204,854,564 | 18,090,833 | 161,872,274 |
| 1972 | 92 | 1490.86 | 216,734,617 | 18, 338,440 | 180, 210,714 |
| 1973 | 92 | 1557.31 | 311,183, 279 | 18,648,610 | 198, 859, 324 |
| 1974 | 92 | 1574.52 | 324,787,253 | 21,728,373 | 220,587,697 |
| 1975 | 99 | 1629.30 | 419,869,718 | 22,841,302 | 243, 428,999 |
| 1976 | 99 | 1696.56 | 448,678,585 | 22,793,386 | 266, 222,385 |
| 1977 | 101 | 1748.55 | 488,779,846 | 27,595,966 | 293, 818, 351 |
| 1978 | 101 | 1768.90 | 494,433,948 | 27,865,892 | 321, 684, 243 |
| 1979 | 104 | 1839.51 | 529, 996,431 | 30,846,555 | 352,530,798 |
| 1980 | 106 | 1889.03 | 623,880,689 | 34,012,618 | 386, 543,416 |
| 1981 | 106 | 1913.57 | 695,487,179 | 35,567,962 | 422,111,378 |
| 1982 | 109 | 1995.74 | 712,299,816 | 42,032,978 | 464,144,356 |
| 1983 | 109 | 2041.94 | 651,035,697 | 46,306,272 | 510,450,628 |
| 1984 | 109 | 2066.80 | 641,783,969 | 48,735,190 | 559,185,818 |
| 1985 | 110 | 2121.49 | 624,641,459 | 56, 875,174 | 616, 060,992 |
| 1986 | 107 | 2139.42 | 552,944,830 | 59,097,819 | 675,158,811 |
| 1987 | 107 | 2148.07 | 551,850,149 | 53,101,745 | 728,260,556 |
| 1988 | 108 | 2164.99 | 555,994,519 | 58,381,022 | 786,641,578 |
| 1989 | 109 | 2205.05 | 586,716,169 | 76,501,442 | 863,143, 020 |
| 1990 | 112 | 2265.64 | 969,735,729 | 81,517,107 | 944,660,127 |
| 1991 | 113 | 2330.30 | 1,289,813,259 | 79,773,732 | 1,024,433,859 |
| 1992* | 115 | 2371.39 | 1,364,817,385 | 82,000,000 | 1,106,433,859 |

*The 1992 Apportionment amount is estimated.

> MUNICIPAL STATE-AId
> 1990 IMPROVED MrLEAGE RECORD
> (BASED ON 1990 CERTIFICATION)

| Municipality | Miteage | Municipality | Mileage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | 17.51 | Faribault | 18.07 |
| Alexandria | 11.09 | Farmington | 6.66 |
| Andover | 20.98 | Fergus Falls | 12.27 |
| Anoka | 11.57 | Forest Lake | 2.99 |
| Apple Valley | 20.42 | Fridley | 21.74 |
| Arden Hills | 3.18 | Golden Valley | 23.30 |
| Austin | 22.34 | Grand Rapids | 10.17 |
| Bemidji | 14.41 | Ham Lake | 16.82 |
| Blaine | 20.77 | Hastings | 12.37 |
| Bloomington | 71.58 | Hermantown | 13.54 |
| Brainerd | 14.01 | Hibbing | 46.32 |
| Brooklyn Center | 21.29 | Hopkins | 9.35 |
| Brooklyn Park | 27.91 | Hutchinson | 9.59 |
| Buffalo | 5.67 | International Falls | 7.87 |
| Burnsville | 36.77 | Inver Grove Heights | 16.98 |
| Champlin | 14.28 | Lake Elmo | 9.52 |
| Chanhassen | 10.09 | Lakeville | 27.91 |
| Chaska | 8.59 | Lino Lakes | 9.03 |
| Chisholm | 6.93 | Litchfield | 7.83 |
| Cloquet | 17.75 | Little Canada | 5.15 |
| Columbia Heights | 11.41 | Little Falls | 13.31 |
| Coon Rapids | 33.02 | Mankato | 25.14 |
| Corcoran | 12.13 | Maple Grove | 28.68 |
| Cottage Grove | 23.55 | Maplewood | 15.16 |
| Crookston | 10.82 | Marshall | 9.83 |
| Crystal | 17.30 | Mendota Heights | 10.47 |
| Detroit Lakes | 9.01 | Minneapolis | 187.12 |
| Duluth | 88.62 | Minnetonka | 39.34 |
| Eagan | 36.59 | Montevideo | 7.54 |
| East Bethel | 19.00 | Moorhead | 23.61 |
| East Grand Forks | 10.62 | Morris | 6.45 |
| Eden Prairie | 31.93 | Mound | 7.51 |
| EdInA | 38.76 | Mounds View | 6.94 |
| Elk River | 18.68 | New Brighton | 10.83 |
| Fairmont | 16.85 | New Hope | 12.32 |
| Falcon Heights | 2.54 | New Ulm | 14.25 |


| Northfield | 9.45 |
| :---: | :---: |
| North Mankato | 9.15 |
| North St. Paul | 6.79 |
| Oakdale | 13.47 |
| ORONO | 10.94 |
| Otsego | 9.30 |
| Owatonna | 17.24 |
| Plymouth | 35.36 |
| Prior Lake | 7.60 |
| Ramsey | 16.97 |
| Red Wing | 18.39 |
| Richfield | 25.60 |
| Robbinsdale | 10.33 |
| Rochester | 40.69 |
| Rosemount | 11.62 |
| Roseville | 20.44 |
| St. Anthony | 5.18 |
| St. Cloud | 34.68 |
| St. Louis Park | 22.13 |
| St. Paul | 154.11 |
| St. Peter | 8.52 |
| Sauk Rapids | 7.61 |
| Savage | 7.85 |
| Shakopee | 12.85 |
| Shoreview | 9.64 |
| Shorewood | 9.32 |
| South St. Paul | 13.58 |
| Spring Lake Park | 4.21 |
| Stillwater | 11.28 |
| Thief River Falls | 10.63 |
| Vadnais Heights | 4.45 |
| Virginia | 11.71 |
| Waseca | 6.31 |
| West St. Paul | 11.62 |
| White Bear Lake | 16.57 |
| Witlmar | 22.87 |
| Winona | 18.43 |
| Woodbury | 17.19 |
| Worthington | 9.80 |
| TOTAL | 2,157.83 |

Certified Mileage Record
(as of December 31, 1990)

| Municipality | Mileage <br> Allowed for Designation | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { M.S.A.S. } \\ \text { Mileage } \\ \text { Designated } \end{gathered}$ | Mileage below Maximum | Trunk Highway Turnback Overage Designated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | 18.84 | 17.51 | 1.33 |  |
| Alexandria | 11.94 | 11.84 | 0.10 |  |
| Andover | 30.47 | 30.11 | 0.36 |  |
| Anoka | 12.40 | 11.94 | 0.46 |  |
| Apple Valley | 29.07 | 27.19 | 1.88 |  |
| Arden Hills | 6.23 | 5.18 | 1.05 |  |
| Austin | 22.69 | 22.47 | 0.22 |  |
| Bemidji | 14.11 | 14.41 | -0.30 | -0.30 |
| Blaine | 32.27 | 31.98 | 0.29 |  |
| Bloomington | 73.91 | 72.93 | 0.98 |  |
| Brainerd | 14.36 | 14.19 | 0.17 |  |
| Brooklyn Center | 21.12 | 21.29 | -0.17 | -0.17 |
| Brooklyn Park | 38.62 | 37.96 | 0.66 |  |
| Buffalo | 6.21 | 5.82 | 0.39 |  |
| Burnsville | 43.01 | 40.47 | 2.54 |  |
| Cambridge | 5.61 |  |  |  |
| Champlin | 15.75 | 15.42 | 0.33 |  |
| Chanhassen | 17.73 | 13.30 | 4.43 |  |
| Chaska | 11.73 | 8.59 | 3.14 |  |
| Chisholm | 7.10 | 6.93 | 0.17 |  |
| Cloquet | 18.00 | 17.75 | 0.25 |  |
| Columbia Heights | 11.95 | 11.41 | 0.54 |  |
| Coon Rapids | 41.46 | 38.54 | 2.92 |  |
| Corcoran | 13.66 | 13.11 | 0.55 |  |
| Cottage Grove | 27.02 | 24.76 | 2.26 |  |
| Crookston | 9.66 | 10.82 | -1.16 | -1.16 |
| Crystal | 17.94 | 17.40 | 0.54 |  |
| Detroit Lakes | 9.12 | 9.01 | 0.11 |  |
| Duluth | 87.19 | 89.68 | -2.49 | -2.49 |
| Eagan | 41.29 | 37.80 | 3.49 |  |
| East Bethel | 22.86 | 21.75 | 1.11 |  |
| East Grand Forks | 9.48 | 10.88 | -1.40 | -1.40 |
| Eden Prairie | 37.09 | 37.40 | -0.31 |  |
| Edina | 39.95 | 38.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Elk River | 22.18 | 21.11 | 1.07 |  |
| Eveleth | 6.09 | 5.98 | 0.11 |  |
| Fairmont | 17.38 | 17.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Falcon Heights | 2.64 | 2.54 | 0.10 |  |
| Faribault | 18.62 | 18.07 | 0.55 |  |
| Farmington | 7.08 | 6.66 | 0.42 |  |
| Fergus Falls | 13.36 | 12.27 | 1.09 |  |
| Forest Lake | 4.62 | 3.69 | 0.93 |  |


| Municipality | Mileage <br> Allowed for Designation | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { M.S.A.S. } \\ \text { Mileage } \\ \text { Designated } \end{gathered}$ | Mileage below Maximum | Trunk Highway Turnback Overage Designated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fridley | 25.10 | 23.94 | 1.16 |  |
| Golden Valley | 23.95 | 23.67 | 0.28 |  |
| Grand Rapids | 11.30 | 10.43 | 0.87 |  |
| Ham Lake | 20.38 | 18.57 | 1.81 |  |
| Hastings | 14.73 | 12.37 | 2.36 |  |
| Hermantown | 13.59 | 12.99 | 0.60 |  |
| Hibbing | 48.45 | 48.36 | 0.09 |  |
| Hopkins | 9.55 | 9.42 | 0.13 |  |
| Hutchinson | 10.70 | 9.59 | 1.11 |  |
| International Falls | 8.00 | 7.87 | 0.13 |  |
| Inver Grove Heights | 20.10 | 19.07 | 1.03 |  |
| Lake Elmo | 9.61 | 9.52 | 0.09 |  |
| Lakeville | 34.45 | 32.72 | 1.73 |  |
| Lino Lakes | 15.30 | 15.12 | 0.18 |  |
| Litchfield | 7.87 | 7.83 | 0.04 |  |
| Little Canada | 5.63 | 5.15 | 0.48 |  |
| Little Falls | 12.66 | 13.80 | -1.14 | -1.14 |
| Mahtomedi | 5.86 |  |  |  |
| Mankato | 23.92 | 25.82 | -1.90 | -1.75 |
| Maple Grove | 37.02 | 35.46 | 1.56 |  |
| Maplewood | 20.74 | 18.03 | 2.71 |  |
| Marshall | 10.54 | 10.33 | 0.21 |  |
| Mendota Heights | 12.69 | 10.47 | 2.22 |  |
| Minneapolis | 187.34 | 187.65 | -0.31 |  |
| Minnetonka | 49.06 | 48.33 | 0.73 |  |
| Monticello | 5.66 |  |  |  |
| Montevideo | 8.20 | 7.54 | 0.66 |  |
| Moorhead | 25.36 | 23.74 | 1.62 |  |
| Morris | 6.70 | 6.45 | 0.25 |  |
| Mound | 8.02 | 8.01 | 0.01 |  |
| Mounds View | 8.53 | 7.22 | 1.31 |  |
| New Brighton | 13.55 | 13.25 | 0.30 |  |
| New Hope | 12.75 | 12.38 | 0.37 |  |
| New Ulm | 14.99 | 14.25 | 0.74 |  |
| Northfield | 10.30 | 10.13 | 0.17 |  |
| North Mankato | 9.94 | 9.15 | 0.79 |  |
| North St. Paul | 8.46 | 8.00 | 0.46 |  |
| Oakdale | 14.74 | 14.08 | 0.66 |  |
| Orono | 12.25 | 10.94 | 1.31 |  |
| Otsego | 12.48 | 12.33 | 0.15 |  |
| Owatonna | 18.54 | 17.51 | 1.03 |  |
| Plymouth | 45.63 | 42.55 | 3.08 |  |


| Municipality | Mileage <br> Allowed for Designation | $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { M.S.A.S. } \\ \text { Mileage } \\ \text { Designated } \end{gathered}$ | Mileage below Maximum | Trunk Highway Turnback Overage Designated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prior Lake | 12.82 | 12.56 | 0.26 |  |
| Ramsey | 26.72 | 25.80 | 0.92 |  |
| Red Wing | 20.87 | 20.45 | 0.42 |  |
| Redwood Falls | 5.97 | 5.61 | 0.36 |  |
| Richfield | 26.29 | 26.18 | 0.11 |  |
| Robbinsdale | 10.01 | 10.33 | -0.32 | -0.32 |
| Rochester | 48.80 | 44.13 | 4.67 |  |
| Rosemount | 16.49 | 13.52 | 2.97 |  |
| Roseville | 23.19 | 22.50 | 0.69 |  |
| St. Anthony | 5.48 | 5.18 | 0.30 |  |
| St. Cloud | 34.19 | 35.47 | -1.28 |  |
| St. Louis Park | 26.23 | 25.27 | 0.96 |  |
| St. Paul | 158.10 | 154.84 | 3.26 |  |
| St. Peter | 8.73 | 8.52 | 0.21 |  |
| Sartell | 4.00 | 4.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Sauk Rapids | 8.39 | 7.92 | 0.47 |  |
| Savage | 12.10 | 11.42 | 0.68 |  |
| Shakopee | 15.99 | 14.15 | 1.84 |  |
| Shoreview | 16.44 | 12.56 | 3.88 |  |
| Shorewood | 9.35 | 9.32 | 0.03 |  |
| South St. Paul | 14.50 | 14.33 | 0.17 |  |
| Spring Lake Park | 5.02 | 4.69 | 0.33 |  |
| Stillwater | 12.94 | 11.98 | 0.96 |  |
| Thief River Falls | 11.33 | 11.17 | 0.16 |  |
| Vadnais Heights | 6.86 | 5.59 | 1.27 |  |
| Virginia | 12.38 | 11.99 | 0.39 |  |
| Waite Park | 3.68 |  |  |  |
| Waseca | 6.65 | 6.31 | 0.34 |  |
| West St. Paul | 12.26 | 11.62 | 0.64 |  |
| White Bear Lake | 18.21 | 17.82 | 0.39 |  |
| Willmar | 21.17 | 22.87 | -1.70 | -1.70 |
| Winona | 19.76 | 19.66 | 0.10 |  |
| Woodbury | 28.00 | 24.13 | 3.87 |  |
| Worthington | 10.58 | 9.80 | 0.78 |  |
| TOTALS | 2459.95 | 2352. 22 | 86.92 | $-10.43$ |
| 1989 Mileage | 2395.44 | 2270.57 | 124.87 | -14.65 |
| Increase from 1989 | 64.51 | 81.65 | -37.95 | -4.22 |

## Theoretical 1991 M.S.A.s. Population Apportionment

The 1990 census was used to determine the estimated population Apportionment. Adjustments to the population were made due to annexations or detachments which include people. Due to the census, 4 new cities offically exceeded 5,000 population, they are Cambridge, Mahtomedi, Sartell and waite Park. 3 out of the 4 new cities are in District 3. A good probability that Monticello will exceed 5,000 population when they resolve a boundry dispute with the Federal Census Bureau that included people. Redwood Falls and Eveleth dropped below 5,000 population and will not share in the distribution of Municipal state Aid funds. The final population data will be certified December 31,1991 by the State Demographer and the actual apportionment sum available to urban municipalities in 1992 will be provided by the office of Finance and Accounting in January of 1992.

Fifty percent of the total sum is distributed on a prorated share that each city population bears to the total population. Each person earned approximately 15.55 in apportionment from the 1991 population apportionment distribution. Due to the 1990 census, the cities over 5,000 population increased by 246,616 people. This increase in population lowers the amount that cities receive per person to $\$ 14.63$. This projection will be somewhat revised when the actual revenue for the 1992 apportionment becomes available or if additional cities should exceed 5,000 population prior to January 1, 1992.

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 162.13, Subdivision 1 (2) which reads as follows: "An amount equal to 50 percent of such apportionment SUM SHALL BE APPORTIONED AMONG THE CITIES HAVING A POPULATION OF 5,000 or more so that each such city shall receive of such amount the percentage that its population bears to the total population of all SUCH CITIES.
The 1990 Federal Census is used in determining the cities population APPORTIONMENT. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE POPULATION TOTAL DUE TO A SPECIAL U.S. Census shall remain in effect until the next Federal Census is COMPLETED AND FILED.
Whenever an area is annexed or detached, the population of the city WILL be adjusted (added or subtracted) from the Last U.S. census total until the next Federal census is completed and filed.

| Municipalities | POPULATION | Population Apportionment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | 18,310 | \$267,867 |
| Alexandria | 7,838 | 114,666 |
| Andover | 15,216 | 222,603 |
| Anoka |  |  |
| Apple Valley | 34,598 | 506,154 |
| Arden Hills | 9,199 | 134,577 |
| Austin | 21,907 | 320,490 |
| Bemidji | 11,245 | 164,509 |
| Blaine | 38,975 | 570,187 |
| Bloomington |  |  |
| Brainerd | 12,353 | 180,719 |
| Brooklyn Center | 28,887 | 422,604 |
| Brooklyn Park | 56,381 | 824,829 |
| BuFFALO | 6,856 | 100,300 |
| Burnsville | 51,288 | 750,321 |
| Cambridge | 5,094 | 74,523 |
| Champlin | 16,849 | 246,493 |
| Chanhassen | 11,732 | 171,634 |
| Chaska | 11,339 | 165,885 |
| Chisholm | 5,290 | 77,390 |
| Cloquet | 10,885 | 159,243 |
| Columbia Heights |  |  |
| COON RAPIDS | 52,978 | 775,045 |
| Corcoran | 5,199 | 76,059 |
| Cottage Grove |  |  |
| Crookston | 8, 8,719 | 118,777 |
| Crystal | 23,788 | 348,008 |
| Detroit Lakes | 6,635 | 97,067 |
| Duluth | 85,493 | 1,250,725 |
| EAGAN | 47,409 | 693,573 |
| East Bethel. | 8,050 | 117,768 |
| EASt Grand Forks | 8,658 | 126,663 |
| Eden Prairie | 39,311 | 575,103 |


| Edina <br> Elk River <br> FAIRMONT | $\begin{aligned} & 46 ; 070 \\ & 11,143 \\ & 11,265 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 673,984 \\ 163,017 \\ 164,802 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Falcon Heights FARIBAULT FARMINGTON | $\begin{array}{r} 5: 380 \\ 17: 085 \\ 5: 940 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 78,707 \\ 249,946 \\ 86,900 \end{array}$ |
| Fergus Falls Forest Lake FRidley | $\begin{aligned} & 12,362 \\ & 5: 833 \\ & 28,335 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 180,851 \\ 85,334 \\ 414,529 \end{array}$ |
| Golden Valley Grand Rapids ham Lake | $\begin{array}{r} 20,971 \\ 7,976 \\ 8,924 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 306,797 \\ & 116,685 \\ & 130,554 \end{aligned}$ |
| Hastings Hermantown Hibbing | $\begin{aligned} & 15,445 \\ & 6,761 \\ & 18,046 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 225,954 \\ 98,910 \\ 264,005 \end{array}$ |
| Hopkins <br> Hutchinson <br> International Falls | $\begin{array}{r} 16,534 \\ 11,523 \\ 8,325 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 241,885 \\ & 1686,576 \\ & 121,791 \end{aligned}$ |
| Inver Grove Heights Lake Elmo Lakeville | $\begin{aligned} & 22,477 \\ & 5 ; 903 \\ & 24,854 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 328,829 \\ & 86,358 \\ & 363,603 \end{aligned}$ |
| Lino Lakes <br> LITCHFIELD <br> Littie Canada | $\begin{aligned} & 8,807 \\ & 6,041 \\ & 8,971 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128,843 \\ & 88,377 \\ & 131,242 \end{aligned}$ |
| Little Falls <br> Mahtomedi <br> Mankato | $\begin{array}{r} 7,232 \\ 5,569 \\ 31,477 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105,801 \\ 81,472 \\ 460,495 \end{array}$ |
| Maple Grove Maplewood Marshall | $\begin{aligned} & 38,736 \\ & 30,954 \\ & 12,023 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 566,691 \\ & 452,843 \\ & 175,891 \end{aligned}$ |
| Mendota Heights <br> Minneapolis <br> Minnetonka | $\begin{array}{r} 9,431 \\ 368,383 \\ 48,370 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 137,971 \\ 5,389,281 \\ 707,632 \end{array}$ |
| Monticello Montevideo MOORHEAD | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 5,499 \\ 32,295 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 80,448 \\ 472,462 \end{array}$ |
| Morris MOUND Mounds View | $\begin{array}{r} 5,613 \\ 9,634 \\ 12,541 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 82,116 \\ 140,941 \\ 183,469 \end{array}$ |
| New Brighton <br> New Hope <br> New Ulm | $\begin{aligned} & 22 ; 207 \\ & 21 ; 853 \\ & 13,132 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 324,879 \\ & 319,700 \\ & 192,115 \end{aligned}$ |
| Northfield North Mankato North St. Paul | $\begin{aligned} & 14,684 \\ & 10,164 \\ & 12,376 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 214,820 \\ & 148,695 \\ & 181,055 \end{aligned}$ |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OAKDALE } \\ & \text { ORONO } \\ & \text { OTSEGO } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18,374 \\ 7,285 \\ 5,219 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 268,804 \\ 106,576 \\ 76,352 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Owatonna <br> Plymouth <br> Prior Lake | $\begin{aligned} & 19,386 \\ & 50,889 \\ & 11,482 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 283,609 \\ & 744,484 \\ & 167,977 \end{aligned}$ |
| Ramsey <br> Red Wing <br> Richfield |  | $\begin{aligned} & 181,524 \\ & 221,404 \\ & 522,422 \end{aligned}$ |
| Robbinsdale <br> ROCHESTER <br> ROSEMOUNT | $\begin{array}{r} 14,396 \\ 70,997 \\ 8,622 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 210,607 \\ 1,038,655 \\ 126,136 \end{array}$ |
| Roseville <br> ST. ANTHONY <br> St. Cloud | $\begin{array}{r} 33,485 \\ 7,727 \\ 48,812 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 489,871 \\ & 113,043 \\ & 714,098 \end{aligned}$ |
| St. Louis Park <br> St. Paul <br> St. Peter | $\begin{array}{r} 43,787 \\ 272,235 \\ 9,421 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 640,585 \\ 3,982,678 \\ 137,825 \end{array}$ |
| SARTELL <br> SAUK RapidS <br> SAVAGE | $\begin{aligned} & 5,393 \\ & 7,825 \\ & 9,906 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 78,897 \\ 114,476 \\ 144,920 \end{array}$ |
| Shakopee <br> SHOREVIEW <br> SHOREWOOD | $\begin{array}{r} 11,739 \\ 24,587 \\ 5,917 \end{array}$ | 171,736 359,697 86,563 |
| South St. Paul Spring Lake Park Stillwater | $\begin{array}{r} 20,197 \\ 6,532 \\ 13,882 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 295,473 \\ 95,560 \\ 203,088 \end{array}$ |
| Thief River Falls <br> Vadnais Heights <br> Virginia | $\begin{array}{r} 8,010 \\ 11,041 \\ 9,410 \end{array}$ | 117,183 161,525 137,664 |
| Waite Park Waseca West St. Paul | $\begin{array}{r} 5,020 \\ 8,385 \\ 19,248 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 73,440 \\ 122,669 \\ 281,590 \end{array}$ |
| White Bear Lake Willmar Winona | $\begin{aligned} & 24,704 \\ & 17,531 \\ & 25,399 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 361,409 \\ & 256 ; 471 \\ & 371,576 \end{aligned}$ |
| Woodbury WORTHINGTON | $\begin{array}{r} 20,075 \\ 9,977 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 293,688 \\ & 145,959 \end{aligned}$ |
| TOTAL | 2,802,545 | \$41,000,000 |

POPULATION APPORTIONMENT EQUALS TOTAL POPULATION APPORTIONMENT DIVIDED BY TOTAL POPULATION TIMES THE CITY POPULATION.

$$
\$ 41,000,000
$$

2,802,545

## 1991 Needs Study Update

The following tabulation reflects the total difference between the 1990 and the 1991 25-year construction Needs studies. This update was accomplished in two individual steps to measure the effect each type of revision has to the total needs.

1. Accomplishments and system revisions - - includes needs updating and needs of new designations for which resolutions were received by May 1.
2. 1991 Unit Cost Revisions -- measures the effect between last years unit prices to the unit prices approved by the screening Board at the 1991 spring Meeting.
3. 1991 traffic update -- no traffic were received so no updating of traffic counts were done in the 1991 needs study.

Revisions were made to the following needs study unit prices:

| Gravel shoulders | + \$ | . 50 per ton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class 5 base | - \$ | . 50 per ton |
| Bituminous surface \# 2361 | - \$ | 3.00 per ton |

## Signals

Projected traffic


The resulting 1991 25-year Construction Needs as adjusted in the following "Tentative Money Needs Apportionment Determination" will be used in computing the 1992 money needs allotment.

These changes are discussed in more detail in the minutes of the June Screening Board.

1991 M.S.A.S. NEEDS STUDY UPDATE


|  | Municipality | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { M.S.A.S. } \\ & \text { NEEDS } \end{aligned}$ | Accomplish. \& SYstem Revisions | Unit Cost UPDATE | $\underset{\text { MEEDS }}{\stackrel{1991}{\text { M.S. }} .}$ | Net <br> Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% CHANGE } \\ 1990 \text { TO } \\ 1991 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Detroit Lakes | \$3,828,116 | \$42,308 | \$114,431 | \$3,984, 855 | \$156,739 | 4.0944\% |
|  | Duluth | 59,435,944 | 104,313 | 1,024,195 | 60,564,452 | 1,128,508 | 1.8987\% |
|  | Eagan | 12,626,737 | 1,994,730 | 466,297 | 15,087,764 | 2,461,027 | 19.4906\% |
|  | East Bethel | 3,226,571 | $(153,948)$ | 134,833 | 3,207,456 | $(19,115)$ | -0.5924\% |
|  | East Grand Forks | 3,113,105 |  | 62,036 | 3,175,141 | 62,036 | 1.9927\% |
|  | Eden Prairie | 21,012,996 | $(184,103)$ | 546,275 | 21,375,168 | 362,172 | 1.7236\% |
|  | Edina | 19,702,347 | $(272,896)$ | 368,432 | 19,797,883 | 95,536 | 0.4849\% |
|  | Elk River | 8,369,755 | 0 | 138,336 | 8,508,091 | 138,336 | 1.6528\% |
|  | Fairmont | 12,357,816 | 0 | 149,949 | 12,507,765 | 149,949 | 1.2134\% |
|  | Falcon Heights | 680,736 | 0 | 17,058 | 697,794 | 17,058 | 2.5058\% |
|  | Faribault | 9,364,107 | 1,249,327 | 226,779 | 10,840,213 | 1,476,106 | 15.7634\% |
|  | Farmington | 6,116,868 | 679,802 | 110,499 | 6,907,169 | 1,790,301 | 12.9200\% |
| 7 | Fergus Falls | 7,300,675 | 428,906 | 25,464 | 7,755,045 | 454, 370 | 6. 2237\% |
| $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | Forest Lake | 2,104,731 | 596,882 | 27,462 | 2,729,075 | 624,344 | 29.6638\% |
| m | Fridley | 9,790,740 | 0 | 202,576 | 9,993,316 | 202,576 | 2.0691\% |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega}$ | Golden Valley |  |  | 292,913 | 14,594,420 | 1,154,311 |  |
|  | Grand Rapids | $5,031,740$ | $(210,520)$ | $106,058$ | 4,927,278 | $(104,462)$ | $-2.0761 \%$ |
|  | Ham Lake | 3,221,576 | 168,551 | 123,283 | 3,513,410 | 291,834 | 9.0587\% |
|  | Hastings | 4,516,614 | 119,856 | 92,478 | 4,728,948 | 212.334 | 4.7012\% |
|  | Hermantown | 4,031,527 | 2,626,142 | 82,567 | 6,740,236 | 2,708,709 | 67.1882\% |
|  | Hibbing | 20,803,033 | 308,020 | 405,490 | 21,516,543 | 713,510 | 3.4298\% |
|  | Hopkins | 5,429,434 | 621, 10 | 161,649 | 5,591, 083 | 161,649 | 2.9773\% |
|  | Hutchinson | 4,361,769 | 621,107 | 143,425 | 5,126,301 | 764,532 | 17.5280\% |
|  | International Falls | 4,898,531 | 0 | 55,916 | 4,954,447 | 55,916 | 1.1415\% |
|  | Inver Grove Heights | 7,181,757 | 1,101,204 | 99,327 | 8,382,288 |  | 16.7164\% |
|  | Lake Elmo | 2,595,747 | 126,918 | 63,226 | 2,785,891 | 190,144 | 7.3252\% |
|  | Lakeville | 17,816,304 | 1,989,921 | 271,997 | 20,078,222 | 2,261,918 | 12.6958\% |
|  | Lino Lakes | 7,278,191 | $(360,890)$ | 111,936 | 7,029,237 | $(248,954)$ | -3.4205\% |
|  | Litchfield | 3,819,876 | (360,890) | 52,674 | 3,872,550 | 52,674 | 1.3789\% |
|  | Little Canada | 1,060,250 | 1,159,538 | 56,121 | 2,275,909 | 1,215,659 | 114.6578\% |



| Municipality | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { M.S.A.S. } \\ & \text { NEEDS } \end{aligned}$ | Accomplish. \& SYSTEM Revisions | Unit Cost UPDATE | 1991 <br> M.S.A.S. NeEDS | Net Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Change } \\ 1990 \text { TO } \\ 1991 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rochester | \$32,194,716 | \$185,653 | \$1,029,892 | \$33,410,261 | \$1,215,545 | 3.7756\% |
| Rosemount | 7,599, 328 | 1,021,695 | 143,024 | 8,764,047 | 1,164,719 | 15.3266\% |
| Roseville | 6,337,365 | $(180,839)$ | 184,650 | 6,341,176 | 3,811 | 0.0601\% |
| St. Anthony | 1,211,834 | ) | 58,852 | 1,270,686 | 58,852 | 4.8564\% |
| St. Cloud | 16, 694,253 | $(197,473)$ | 656,211 | 17,152,991 | 458,738 | $2.7479 \%$ |
| St. Louis Park | 12,739,298 | 0 | 356,163 | 13,095,461 | 356,163 | 2.7958\% |
| St. Paul | 139,749,018 | 4,471,264 | 3,232,139 | 147,452,421 | 7,703,403 | 5.5123\% |
| St. Peter | 3,180,060 | 16,485 | 51,746 | 3,248, 291 | 68,231 | $2.1456 \%$ |
| Sartell | 0 | 1,874,101 | 28,622 | 1,902,723 | 1,902,723 | 0.0000\% |
| Sauk Rapids | 4,102,612 | 88,725 | 88,271 | 4,279,608 | 176,996 | 4.3142\% |
| Savage | 8,537,560 | 650,272 | 124,784 | 9,312,616 | 775,056 | 9.0782\% |
| Shakopee | 7,932,565 | 545,385 | 167,040 | 8,644,990 | 712,425 | 8.9810\% |
| Shoreview | 4,064,537 | $(223,764)$ | 73,568 | 3,914,341 | $(150,196)$ | -3.6953\% |
| Shorewood | 5,540,016 |  | 63,031 | 5,603,047 | 63, 031 | $1.1377 \%$ |
| South St. Paul | 7,667,688 | $(245,805)$ | 110,865 | 7,532,748 | (134,940) | -1.7599\% |
| Spring Lake Park | 1,742,922 | 360 | 30,617 | 1,773,899 | 30,977 | 1.7773\% |
| Stillwater | 5,948,607 | 1,226, 271 | 136,659 | 7,311,537 | 1,362,930 | 22.9118\% |
| Thief River Falls | 7,193,597 | $(117,663)$ | 132,425 | 7, 208,359 | 14,762 | 0.2052\% |
| Vadnais Heights | 2,135,315 | 6,033 | 33,729 | 2,175,077 | 39,762 | 1.8621\% |
| Virginia | 5,216,495 | 311,468 | 50,201 | 5,578,164 | 361,669 | 6.9332\% |
| Waite Park | 0 | 0 | 543,183 | 543,183 | 543, 183 | 0.0000\% |
| Waseca | 1,729,007 | 0 | 33,061 | 1,762,068 | 33,061 | 1.9121\% |
| West St. Paul | 4,908,752 | 0 | 85,274 | 4,994,026 | 85,274 | 1.7372\% |
| White Bear Lake | 8,039,305 | 1,376,663 | 136,937 | 9,552,905 | 1,513,600 | 18.8275\% |
| Witlmar | 8,965,400 | 23,981 | 136,242 | 9,125,623 | 160,223 | 1.7871\% |
| Winona | 8,576,758 | 1,285,691 | 330,151 | 10,192,600 | 1,615,842 | 18.8398\% |
| Woodbury | 17,064,364 | $(639,542)$ | 284,697 | 16,709,519 | $(354,845)$ | -2.0795\% |
| Worthington | 5,228, 530 | 366,856 | 67,090 | 5,662,476 | 433, 946 | 8.2996\% |
| total | \$1,284,580,425 | , 351,710 | 30,885,250 | 64,817,385 | \$80,236,960 | 6.2462\% |

## 1991 Itemized Tabulation of Needs

The 1991 apportionment needs reflects an increase due to the substantial increase in the unit price of signal costs and the addition of 4 new cities. See the 1991 June minutes for 1991 needs unit prices.

The 1991 itemized tabulation of needs on the following page shows all the construction items except the "after the fact needs" used in the Municipal state Aid Needs study.

The tabulation is provided to give each municipality the opportunity to compare their needs of the individual construction items to that of other cities. The cost per mile shown on this report does not include bridges because large bridges in some cities would distort the average. The average is a more comparable cost for roadway construction cost per mile without bridges.

The average cost per mile is $\$ 577,217$. East Bethel has the lowest cost per mile with $\$ 147,604$ while Farmington has the highest cost with $\$ 1,030,920$ per mile.

Six cities which exceed $\$ 750,000$ per mile are listed alphabetically as follows: Bloomingtom, Buffalo, Farmington, Minneapolis, st. Paul, Savage.
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| Needs <br> Year | Grading | Complete Storm Sewer | Sewer Adjustment | Base Needs | Surface Needs | Total <br> Shoulder <br> Needs | Curb \& Gutter Construction |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | \$157,081,623 | \$148,569,960 | \$17,045,660 | \$205,324,154 | \$230,650,590 | \$934,129 | \$75,296,862 |
| 1990 | 151,449,785 | 145,320,280 | 15,412,580 | 194,459,466 | 229,020,622 | 834,973 | 72,909,982 |
| Difference | \$5,631,838 | \$3,249,680 | \$1,633,080 | \$10,864,688 | \$1,629,968 | \$99,156 | \$2,386,880 |
| $\%$ | 3.59\% | 2.19\% | 9.58\% | $5.29 \%$ | $0.71 \%$ | 10.61\% | 3.17\% |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Needs | Sidewalk | Traffic | Signal | Street <br> Lighting <br> Construction | Construction | Construction |


| Needs Year | Total Maintenance Needs | Total Apportionment Cost | Total Mileage | After the fact Right of way Needs | After the fact Bridge Needs | Overall <br> Apportionment Needs |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | \$13,256,720 | \$1,363,446,144 | 2362.10 | 29,649,351 | 13,438,470 | 1,322,264,472 | 16.1252 * |
| 1990 | 13,007,500 | 1,281,200,061 | 2317.97 | 27,625,941 | 13,438,470 | 1,281,200,061 | 16.0592 |
| Difference \% | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 249,220 \\ 1.88 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 82,246,083 \\ 6.03 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44.13 \\ 1.87 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2,023,410 \\ 6.82 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0 \\ 0.00 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 41,064,411 \\ 3.11 \% \end{array}$ |  |

* Used an estimated amount of $\$ 82,000,000$ for the 1992 apportionment.

Total mileage and needs includes Mahtomedi and Sartell.

October 30, 1991

John H. Riley, Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Transportation
Room 411
State Transportation Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
Dear Commissioner Riley,
We, the undersigned, as members of the 1991 Municipal Screening Board, having reviewed all information available in relation to the 25 year money needs of the Municipal State Aid Street System, do hereby submit our findings as required by Minnesota Statutes.

We recommend that these findings be modified as required by Screening Board Resolutions, and that any new municipalities that become eligible for State Aid by spectal census, incorporation or annexation have their mileage and resulting money needs established and included in our FINDINGS.

This Board, therefore, recommends that the money needs, as listed on the ATTACHED, BE MODIFIED AS REQUIRED AND USED AS THE BASIS FOR APPORTIONING to the urban municipalities the 1992 Apportionment Sum as provided by Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 162.13, Subdivision 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Grube
Chairman

Approved by:

Jim Prusak
District 1

Alvin Moen
District 4

Pete McClurg District 7

Kenneth Larson DuLuth

Dan EDWARDS
VICE CHAIRMAN

David Kildahl District 2

Michael Eastling District 5

Dale Swanson District 8

Marv Hoshaw
Minneapolis

Alan Gray Secretary

Sidney Williamson District 3

Thomas Drake District 6

Kenneth Haider DISTRICT 9

Attachment: Money Needs Listing
Page 49

| Municipality | Money Needs | Municipality | Money Needs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | \$9,943,768 | Fergus Falls | \$7,755,045 |
| Alexandria | 6,917,363 | Forest Lake | 2,729,075 |
| Andover | 12,733,587 | Fridley | 9,993,316 |
| Anoka | 5,528,827 | Golden Valley | 14,594,420 |
| Apple Valley | 13,060,787 | Grand Rapids | 4,927,278 |
| Arden Hills | 2,300,316 | Ham Lake | 3,513,410 |
| Austin | 16,717,866 | Hastings | 4,728,948 |
| Bemidji | 8,889,972 | Hermantown | 6,740,236 |
| Blaine | 12,234,788 | Hibbing | 21,516,543 |
| Bloomington | 58,327,294 | Hopkins | 5,591,083 |
| Brainerd | 5,825,344 | Hutchinson | 5,126,301 |
| Brooklyn Center | 12,793,116 | International Falls | 4,954,447 |
| Brooklyn Park | 16,047,188 | Inver Grove Heights | 8,382,288 |
| Buffalo | 4,500,653 | Lake Elmo | 2,785,891 |
| Burnsville | 17,391,607 | LaKEVilLE | 20,078,222 |
| Cambridge | 828,058 | Lino Lakes | 7,029,237 |
| Champlin | 4,700,751 | Litchfield | 3,872,550 |
| Chanhassen | 5,926,530 | Little Canada | 2,275,909 |
| Chaska | 4,957,386 | Little Falls | 6,707,375 |
| Chisholm | 3,887,600 | Mahtomedi | 1,835,453 |
| Cloquet | 11,601,263 | Mankato | 15,689,012 |
| Columbia Heights | 6,775,760 | Maple Grove | 20,307,104 |
| COON Rapids | 14, 463,332 | Maplewood | 9,790,502 |
| Corcoran | 5,481,088 | Marshall | 3,200,238 |
| Cottage Grove | 12,592,702 | Mendota Heights | 4,148,620 |
| Crookston | 5,436,196 | Minneapolis | 167,351,274 |
| Crystal | 10,124,764 | Minnetonka | 26,403,632 |
| Detroit Lakes | 3,984,855 | Montevideo | 2,877,440 |
| Duluth | 60,564,452 | Moorhead | 12,836,431 |
| Eagan | 15,087,764 | Morris | 2,552,543 |
| East Bethel | 3,207,456 | Mound | 3,210,029 |
| East Grand Forks | 3,175,141 | Mounds View | 2,171,160 |
| Eden Prairie | 21,375,168 | New Brighton | 6,727,206 |
| Edina | 19,797,883 | New Hope | 8,353,150 |
| Elk River | 8,508,091 | New Ulm | 7,573,989 |
| Fairmont | 12,507,765 | Northfield | 6,988,329 |
| Falcon Heights | 697,794 | North Mankato | 3,483,982 |
| Faribault | 10,840,213 | North St. Paul | 2,961,413 |
| Farmington | 6,907,169 | Oakdale | 7,073,948 |


| Municipality | Money Needs |
| :---: | :---: |
| Orono | \$6,349,432 |
| Otsego | 8,090,104 |
| Owatonna | 11,454,865 |
| Plymouth | 21,319,570 |
| Prior Lake | 6,093,606 |
| Ramsey | 8,142,793 |
| Red Wing | 12,897,781 |
| Richfield | 15,499,501 |
| Robbinsdale | 4,976,204 |
| Rochester | 33,410,261 |
| Rosemount | 8,764,047 |
| Roseville | 6,341,176 |
| St. Anthony | 1,270,686 |
| St. Cloud | 17,152,991 |
| St. Louis Park | 13,095,461 |
| St. Paul | 147,452,421 |
| St. Peter | 3,248,291 |
| Sartell | 1,902,723 |
| Sauk Rapids | 4,279,608 |
| SAVAGE | 9,312,616 |
| Shakopee | 8,644,990 |
| Shoreview | 3,914,341 |
| Shorewood | 5,603,047 |
| South St. Paul | 7,532,748 |
| Spring Lake Park | 1,773,899 |
| Stillwater | 7,311,537 |
| Thief River Falls | 7,208,359 |
| Vadnais Heights | 2,175,077 |
| Virginia | 5,578,164 |
| Waite Park | 543,183 |
| Waseca | 1,762,068 |
| West St. Paul | 4,994,026 |
| White Bear Lake | 9,552,905 |
| Willmar | 9,125,623 |
| Winona | 10,192,600 |
| Woodbury | 16,709,519 |
| Worthington | 5,662,476 |
| STATE TOTAL | ,364,817,385 |

## Tentative 1991 Money Needs Apportionment Determination

This tabulation shows each municipality's tentative money needs apportionment based on a projected apportionment amount. The actual amount of the road user fund for distribution to the Municipal State Aid Account will not be available until January 1992.

The 25-year Construction Needs shown on this report are those computed from the "1991 Needs Study Update". The adjusted 25-year construction needs are the result of subtracting for the excess unencumbered construction fund balance, Unencumbered Construction Fund balance, Expenditures off the Municipal State Aid System, and adding or subtracting for Bond Accounts, adding for Non-existing Bridge Adjustments, Right-of-Way "After the fact" needs, and subtracting the cost of Bituminous Overlays and Concrete Joint Repairs on segments that receive complete needs and Variances. These adjustments to the actual needs are made as directed by the Screening Board resolutions.

This summary provides specific data and shows the impact of the adjustments to each municipality for the Screening Board's use in establishing the 1992 Money Needs Apportionment Determination.

The adjustments are listed individually following the tentative summary of adjustments to the 1991 actual 25-year Construction Needs.

| Muricipality | $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \text { Fotual } \\ & \text { E5-Year } \\ & \text { Corest. } \\ & \text { Needs } \end{aligned}$ | ExCe5s Grencernbered Construction Fund Selance Deduction | Urencunbered Construction Furd Eblance Deduction | - - <br> Expend. Off-5tate Aid System | (tor - -1 Elond Account Mdjustnert | (+) NoriExisting Eridge Mdjustment | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{l} i+1 \\ R / W \\ \text { Acquisition } \\ \text { Ajustrant } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | (-) <br> Gituminous Gverlay find Concrete Joint Repair | (-) <br> Variance Adjustments | Total affect of Adjustnents | Adjusted 25 -Year Const. | Money Needs Appart. mirus (THTE Adj.) | ( + ) <br> Turriback Maisteriasce Adjustment | 1792 <br> Honey Needs Appont. | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { Dist. } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea <br> Alexandria <br> Andover <br> Aroke <br> Apple Valley | $\begin{array}{r} +9,943,768 \\ 6,917,363 \\ 12,73,587 \\ 5,568,87 \\ 13,050,797 \end{array}$ | $\overline{-}$ $\overline{-}$ - | $\begin{array}{r} \{9543,349) \\ (12,650\} \\ - \\ \{12,107) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \{+79,953\} \\ (161,571) \\ (11,955) \\ (52,363) \\ (230,701) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ \$ 510,000 \\ 135,0001 \\ 670,000 \end{gathered}$ | 4245,320 | $\begin{aligned} & 143,283 \\ & 2,974 \\ & \hline 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (485,366) \\ & (14,214) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} (\$ 677,987) \\ (370,187) \\ 643,328 \\ (515,7301 \\ 439,299 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 49,265,781 \\ 6,547,176 \\ 13,376,915 \\ 5,013,097 \\ 13,50,096 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4293,498 \\ & 207,495 \\ & 423,720 \\ & 158,792 \\ & 427,622 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 493,499 \\ & 207,385 \\ & 423,720 \\ & 159,792 \\ & 427,620 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.716 \% \\ & 0.506 \% \\ & 1.033 \% \\ & 0.387 \% \\ & 1.043 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Arcien Hills <br> Austin <br> Eemidji <br> Blaine <br> Blocmiziton | $\begin{array}{r} 2,300,316 \\ 16,717,866 \\ 8,897972 \\ 12,234,769 \\ 50,327,294 \end{array}$ | - - - - | $\begin{gathered} (76,176) \\ (66,6,44) \\ (1679,32) \\ (1,945,723) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (900,983) \\ (62,53) \\ (152,964) \\ (30,94) \\ (3,293,960) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{Z} \\ & \overline{-} \end{aligned}$ | 2,326,375 | $\begin{aligned} & 149,479 \\ & \frac{11,141}{83,491} \end{aligned}$ | (65, 884 ) | - - - - | $\begin{array}{r} (90,983) \\ (1,350,400) \\ (631,226) \\ (90,593) \\ (2,198,751) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,219,333 \\ 15,357,466 \\ 9,258,746 \\ 11,366,195 \\ 56,179,543 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 70,273 \\ 48,72 \\ 261,500 \\ 35,763 \\ 1,773,444 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 70,299 \\ 46,72 \\ 261,600 \\ 359,63 \\ 1,779,444 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.171 \% \\ & 1.188 \% \\ & 0.639 \% \\ & 0.875 \% \\ & 4.340 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Erainerd Eracklyn Center Frocklym Fark Euffalo Eurmsville | $\begin{array}{r} 5,85,344 \\ 12,73,116 \\ 16,047,188 \\ 4,501,653 \\ 17,391,607 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} (4,750,054 \\ -- \\ - \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (510,631) \\ (2,37,0,027) \\ (77,934) \end{array}$ | \{29; 210$\}$ <br> (886, 830 ) | $\begin{aligned} & 320,000 \\ & 60,000 \\ & - \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ \overline{343,584} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,100 \\ 5,302 \\ \hline-30,706 \end{array}$ | - - - - | $\begin{aligned} & -\overline{--} \\ & \overline{--} \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 190,631 \\ 13, \\ \{7,145,690 \\ 17,934 \\ 393,760 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,634,713 \\ 12,92,216 \\ 9,900,529 \\ 4,42,719 \\ 17,785,357 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 178,482 \\ & 409,539 \\ & 281,99 \\ & 140,092 \\ & 563,360 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ 11, \overline{016} \\ \overline{-} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 178,482 \\ & 409,539 \\ & 272,345 \\ & 140,092 \\ & 563,360 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.435 \% \\ & 0.999 \\ & 0.714 \% \\ & 0.342 \times \\ & 1.374 x \end{aligned}$ |
| Cambridge <br> Champlin <br> Charhas5et Chaska Chistolm | $\begin{array}{r} 928,658 \\ 4,700,751 \\ 5,926,530 \\ 4,957,386 \\ 3,887,600 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -\bar{\prime}(165,(19) \\ & (244,759) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \{15,512\} \\ (423,126\} \\ (34,914) \end{gathered}$ | -- | $-$ | $\begin{gathered} 5,544 \\ 5,400 \\ 5,467 \end{gathered}$ | $--$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 00,032 \\ (100,019) \\ (572,619) \\ \{34,914\} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 828,058 \\ & 4,720,783 \\ & 5,926,511 \\ & 4,384,758 \\ & 3,852,686 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26,229 \\ & 151,434 \\ & 164,550 \\ & 138,990 \\ & 12,4,036 \end{aligned}$ | $3,988$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.064 x \\ & 0.373 \\ & 0.450 \\ & 0.339 \\ & 0.298 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Cloquet <br> Columbia Keights <br> Coon Rapids <br> Corcorar: <br> Cottaye Grove | $\begin{array}{r} 11,601,263 \\ 5,775,760 \\ 14,463,332 \\ 5,491,089 \\ 12,592,702 \end{array}$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & (595,848) \\ & (534,304) \\ & (589,698) \\ & (21,610) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (30,745) \\ & (23,711) \\ & (19,435) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1, \overline{3 D,} \overline{2}-48 \\ & (399,814) \end{aligned}$ | - | $\begin{array}{r} 13,539 \\ 6,500 \\ 53,609 \\ \hline 5 ; 103 \end{array}$ | $(197,318)$ |  | $\begin{gathered} (553,54) \\ (174,53) \\ 1,254,23 \\ (354,351) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11,048,209 \\ & 6,150,927 \\ & 15,717,545 \\ & 5,481,088 \\ & 12,239,381 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 349,958 \\ & 191,665 \\ & 497,861 \\ & 173,516 \\ & 387,657 \end{aligned}$ | - - - | $\begin{aligned} & 349,959 \\ & 191,666 \\ & 497,861 \\ & 173,616 \\ & 397,657 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.954 \% \\ & 0.467 \% \\ & 1.214 \% \\ & 0.423 \% \\ & 0.746 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Crookston <br> Crystal <br> Detroit Lakes <br> Duluth <br> Eagan | $\begin{aligned} & 5,435,196 \\ & 10,114,764 \\ & 3,984,855 \\ & 60,564,450 \\ & 15,087,764 \end{aligned}$ | $\square$ <br> - <br> $\square$ | $(930,971)$ | $\begin{aligned} & (112,718) \\ & \langle 564,466\rangle \end{aligned}$ |  | $1,054,200$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,169,538 \\ & 3,215,277 \\ & 175,250 \\ & 39,509 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \overline{(0,257)} \\ (462,853) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ \{537,420) \\ -- \\ -- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,109,539 \\ 1,623,711 \\ 2,703,131 \\ 2,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 5,544,734 \\ 11,754,575 \\ 3,994,855 \\ 60,766,583 \\ 17,921,272 \end{array}$ |  | 11,376 <br> $-\overline{297}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 219,634 \\ 3,335 \\ 1,56,25 \\ 1,57,109 \\ 564,466 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.533 \% \\ & 0.909 \\ & . .309 \% \\ & 4.700 \\ & 1.377 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| East Bethel <br> East Grand Forks <br> Eden Prairie <br> Edira <br> Elk River | $\begin{array}{r} 3,207,456 \\ 3,175,4148 \\ 21,37,168 \\ 19,797,983 \\ 3,508,091 \end{array}$ | - - - - | (1,785, $\mathbf{L}_{141}$ | (133, 7509 | 75,000 461,663 | $974,299$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17,200 \\ 31,700 \\ 45,296 \\ 8,000 \end{array}$ | - $m$ $m$ $m$ $m$ $m$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 17,200 \\ 162,900 \\ 1,280,532 \\ (2,70,503) \\ 8,000 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 102,143 \\ & 105,736 \\ & 717,734 \\ & 541,283 \\ & 569,751 \end{aligned}$ | -- -- -- | $\begin{aligned} & 102,143 \\ & 105,736 \\ & 717,634 \\ & 541,293 \\ & 269,751 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.249 \% \\ & 0.258 \% \\ & 1.750 \% \\ & 1.320 \\ & 0.658 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Faimont. <br> Falcon Heights <br> Faribault <br> Farmington <br> Fergus Falls | $\begin{array}{r} 12,507,765 \\ 697,794 \\ 10,840,213 \\ 6,907,169 \\ 7,755,945 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\square \\ \square \\ - \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $(311,293)$ | (37, 712 | $\stackrel{\text { (27, } 9889}{ }$ | - $\cdots$ - | $\begin{gathered} 23,732 \\ \frac{2}{2,346} \\ 7,133 \\ 67,200 \end{gathered}$ | $\overline{\overline{-}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \{529,415\} \\ & (195,496) \end{aligned}$ | (505, 683) (223,484) (346,659) 7,133 26,298 | $\begin{gathered} 12,002,082 \\ 474,310 \\ 10,493,554 \\ 6,914,302 \\ 7,78,343 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 380,172 \\ & 15,024 \\ & 33,399 \\ & 217,014 \\ & 245,478 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 390,172 \\ & 15,42 \\ & 33,389 \\ & 249,344 \\ & 246,478 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.327 \% \\ & 0.037 \% \\ & 0.811 \% \\ & 0.534 \% \\ & 0.601 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Forest Lake Fridley Golden Valley Grand Rapids Han Lake | $\begin{array}{r} 2,729,075 \\ 9,993,316 \\ 14,594,420 \\ 4,927,278 \\ 3,513,410 \end{array}$ | (2, 797, 344 ) | $\begin{array}{r} (150,366) \\ (1,393,572) \\ (789,691) \\ (167,484) \\ (423,533) \end{array}$ | (125, 799) <br> (475, 485) | $\begin{gathered} \overline{5}, 000 \\ 20,000 \end{gathered}$ | 553, | $\begin{array}{r} 5,853 \\ 1,40,455 \\ 25,016 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \cdots \\ & \cdots \\ & \cdots \\ & \cdots-m \\ & -m \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{I} \\ & \overline{=} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (150,366) \\ (4,30,162) \\ (124,548) \\ 391,374 \\ (377,517) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,578,709 \\ 5,691,154 \\ 14,469,872 \\ 5,318,652 \\ 3,135,993 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81,682 \\ & 180,270 \\ & 45,240 \\ & 168,371 \\ & 9,431 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \\ & = \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 81,688 \\ 180,270 \\ 459,340 \\ 469,471 \\ 9,331 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.199 \% \\ & 0.440 \% \\ & 1.118 \% \\ & 0.411 \% \\ & 0.242 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Hastirgs <br> Hermantown <br> Hibbirg <br> Hopkins <br> Hutchinson | $\begin{gathered} 4,728,948 \\ 6,740,236 \\ 21,51,543 \\ 5,591,083 \\ 5,12,301 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & - \\ & -- \\ & -\infty \end{aligned}$ | (495, 387) $(12,249)$ | $\begin{array}{r} (314,763) \\ (107,039\} \\ (1090,705) \\ (273,473) \end{array}$ | $(253,687)$ | $\begin{gathered} 233,038 \\ \overline{-} \\ 570,793 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17,600 \\ & \frac{29,403}{78,75} \end{aligned}$ | $(182,219)$ | $\{194,459)$ | $\begin{aligned} & (68,305) \\ & (68,24, \\ & (201,477) \\ & (487,414) \\ & (16,175) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,664,643 \\ 6,656,974 \\ 61,235,946 \\ 5,5103,669 \\ 4,954,126 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 147,755 \\ & 191,658 \\ & 672,631 \\ & 161661,64 \\ & 157,24 \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{\overline{3}} \overline{341}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 147,755 \\ & 191,858 \\ & 693,572 \\ & 161661 \\ & 157,241 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.360 \% \\ & 0.468 \% \\ & 1.667 \% \\ & 0.394 \% \\ & 0.384 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Intermational Falls <br> Inver Erave Heights <br> Lake Elmo <br> Lakpville <br> Lino Lakes | $\begin{array}{r} 4,934,417 \\ 8,382,280 \\ 2,795,891 \\ 20,470,242 \\ 7,02,237 \end{array}$ | - <br> $\square$ <br> - <br> - | $\begin{gathered} (351,257) \\ (6,797) \\ (30,453) \\ (E 92,470) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \{148,165\} \\ (1,055,369) \end{array}$ | $\square$ - - | -- <br> -- <br> - | $\begin{array}{r} 617,797 \\ 9,556 \\ -74,550 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -- \\ & -- \\ & -- \\ & -- \end{aligned}$ | $-=$ <br> - <br> - <br> - | $\begin{array}{r} (351,257) \\ 40,45 \\ (205,897) \\ (1105,50) \\ 1527,500 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,503,190 \\ 8,785,133 \\ 2,57,934 \\ 19,614,862 \\ 5,501,717 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145,808 \\ & 278,305 \\ & 81,723 \\ & 603,192 \\ & 205,945 \end{aligned}$ | - - - - | $\begin{aligned} & 145,909 \\ & 278,305 \\ & 81,723 \\ & 603,192 \\ & 20,945 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Litchfield Little Canada Little Falls Mahtomedi Mankato | $\begin{array}{r} 3,872,530 \\ 2,275,909 \\ 6,707,375 \\ 1,935,453 \\ 15,689,012 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}\square \\ \square \\ - \\ - \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (233,350\} \\ & \{181,889\} \\ & \{124,230\} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} {[73,3317} \\ \overline{-} \\ \overline{(745,865)} \end{gathered}$ | 291,783 | - - - | $\begin{array}{r} 43,300 \\ 10,3,165 \\ 4 E 4,406 \end{array}$ | - | - | $\begin{gathered} (59,475) \\ 35,4,853 \\ (79,723) \\ 0 \\ (445,689) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,369,074 \\ & 2,610,972 \\ & 6,629,652 \\ & 1,955,453 \\ & 15,243,323 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105,527 \\ 82,704 \\ 209,965 \\ 59.139 \\ 492,840 \end{array}$ | 5,328 | $\begin{array}{r} 106,597 \\ 8,704 \\ 20,965 \\ 59,139 \\ 489,168 \end{array}$ |  |
| Maple Grove <br> Maplewod <br> Marshall <br> Mendata Heights <br> Mimeapolis | $\begin{array}{r} 20,307,104 \\ 9,790,500 \\ 3,20,239 \\ 4,48,60 \\ 167,351,274 \end{array}$ | $10,300,590\}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (1,150,295\} \\ (286,596) \\ (475,727) \\ (11,883,739) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (2896) \\ (26,978) \\ (7,716) \\ (2,815,337) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (19,701) \\ & 45,000 \\ & 174,5047 \\ & 140,000 \end{aligned}$ | $1,493,191$ | $\begin{array}{r} 311,626 \\ 59,320 \\ 8,70 \\ 5,652,348 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \\ & (71,714) \end{aligned}$ | -- -- -- | $\begin{array}{r} 291,029 \\ (3,43,963) \\ (30,780 \\ (334,473) \\ (6,625,251) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 20,598,133 \\ 6,37,539 \\ 2,997,458 \\ 3 ; 14,4147 \\ 160,726,023 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 659,456 \\ 99,381 \\ 91,778 \\ 10,915 \\ 5,091,077 \end{array}$ | 3,500 - - | $\begin{array}{r} 655,056 \\ 20,591 \\ 71,789 \\ 10,915 \\ 5,091,077 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.600 \% \\ & 0.491 \% \\ & 0.224 \% \\ & 0.695 \% \\ & 12.417 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Mimetorka <br> Montevideo <br> Morrbead <br> Morris <br> mound | $\begin{gathered} 26,403,632 \\ 2,877,440 \\ 12,936,431 \\ 2,552,543 \\ 3,210,029 \end{gathered}$ | $-m$ $-\infty$ $-m$ $-m$ $-m$ $-m$ | $\begin{gathered} (1,919,145) \\ (255,76) \\ (855,341\} \\ (304,498) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (3,270,785) \\ (282,575) \\ (187,741) \\ (322,996) \end{array}$ | - - - | - - -- | $\begin{gathered} 292,150 \\ 101,305 \\ 15,476 \\ 107,445 \end{gathered}$ | $\bar{\square}$ | - - - - | $\begin{array}{r} \{4,906,781\} \\ (255,776) \\ (1,189,801) \\ (17,255) \\ (50,0,08) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21,495,851 \\ 2,621,664 \\ 11,546,630 \\ 2,380,278 \\ 2,690,001 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 680,524 \\ 8,043 \\ 368,913 \\ 75,396 \\ 85,207 \end{gathered}$ | - - - | $\begin{gathered} 680,324 \\ 83,043, \\ 368,913 \\ 75,396 \\ 85,207 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| mounds Vies <br> Nem Briphtorn <br> New Hope <br> Hew Ulif <br> Northfield | $\begin{aligned} & 2,171,160 \\ & 6,727,206 \\ & 8,353,150 \\ & 7,573,989 \\ & 6,988,329 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11,129,526) \\ - \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (564,76,3) \\ \overline{-} \\ \overline{(444,623)} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (260,996\} \\ (1,356,512) \\ (452,481) \\ (144,326) \\ \{23,857 \end{array}$ | - - - - |  | $\overline{-}$ | $(174,83)$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & - \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (1,955,185) \\ (1,355,912) \\ (6,37,313) \\ (144,326) \\ (673,610) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 215,975 \\ 5,37,974 \\ 7,705,937 \\ 7,423,663 \\ 6,314,719 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,941 \\ 170,107 \\ 244,720 \\ 235,338 \\ 200,022 \end{array}$ | - | $\begin{array}{r} 6,841 \\ 170,107 \\ 244,720 \\ 235,338 \\ 200,052 \end{array}$ | $0.017 \%$ $0.45 \%$ $0.57 \times 1$ 0.578 0.4888 |
| North Markato <br> Warth St. Faul <br> Oakdale <br> Orono <br> Dtsega | $\begin{aligned} & 3,483,982 \\ & 2,96,413 \\ & 7,073,948 \\ & 6,349,432 \\ & 8,090,104 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ (1,247,108) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (203,677) \\ (413) \\ --1623,554) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (22,792) \\ \{414,070) \\ -190,000) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \{20,000\} \\ -- \\ (65,253) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 395,145 \\ 54,744 \\ - \\ - \end{gathered}$ | $(278,675)$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & \overline{-} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (57,303) \\ (668,45) \\ (2,125,915) \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3,426,659 \\ & 5,29,998 \\ & 7,072,948 \\ & 4,22,517 \\ & 0,090,104 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 108,541 \\ & 72,63 \\ & 204,071 \\ & 133,782 \\ & 255,259 \end{aligned}$ | - -- -- | $\begin{array}{r} 108,541 \\ 72,632 \\ 284 \\ 133,782 \\ 256,258 \end{array}$ |  |
| Owatoma <br> Flynouth <br> Frior Lake <br> Ramsey <br> Red Hing | $\begin{aligned} & 1,454,865 \\ & 21,319,570 \\ & 6,63,606 \\ & 8,142,793 \\ & 12,897,781 \end{aligned}$ | $-$ | $\begin{aligned} & (645,091) \\ & (275,340) \\ & 1134,078) \\ & (533,298) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (793,946) \\ (37,837) \end{array}$ | - - - | $1,145,475$ | $\begin{gathered} 113,639 \\ 103,413 \\ 20,125 \\ 167,999 \\ 76,176 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & \overline{-} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $(293,858)$ $\overline{=}$ | $\begin{gathered} (964,165) \\ (579,515) \\ (66,215) \\ 33,881 \\ 688,363 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10,490,699 \\ 20,740,055 \\ 6,07,391 \\ 0,96,674 \\ 13,586,144 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 332,299 \\ & 656,952 \\ & 190,92 \\ & 259,634 \\ & 430,348 \end{aligned}$ | - - - - | $\begin{aligned} & 332,298 \\ & 656,952 \\ & 190,921 \\ & 259,634 \\ & 430,349 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Richfield <br> Robbimgdale <br> Rochester <br> Fosemount <br> Raseville | $\begin{gathered} 15,499,501 \\ 4,376,604 \\ 3,3,410,261 \\ 9,764,047 \\ 6,341,176 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (250,140) \\ - \\ - \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (1,301,679) \\ (1682,499) \\ (1,615,301) \\ (704,697) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (66 ; 193) \\ & (773 ; 487) \\ & (43 ; 384) \\ & (46 ; 989) \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\bar{a}}{1,955,000}$ | $2,814,714$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,947,938 \\ & 1,456,986 \\ & 1,385,005 \end{aligned}$ | $(170,511)$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & \overline{-} \\ & - \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 580,066 \\ (1,006,095) \\ (372,810) \\ (46,389) \\ 5,308,082 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,979,567 \\ 3,970,109 \\ 33,036,551 \\ 8,717,058 \\ 11,729,198 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 509,329 \\ 125,75 \\ 1,046,446 \\ 276,117 \\ 311,528 \end{array}$ | - - - - | $\begin{gathered} 519,328 \\ 15,755 \\ 1,046,446 \\ 276,17 \\ 371 ; 528 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 5t. Arthony <br> 5t. Cloud <br> St. Louis Park <br> St. Paul <br> St. Peter | $\begin{array}{r} 1,270,686 \\ 17,158,991 \\ 13,095,461 \\ 147,45,481 \\ 3,248,591 \end{array}$ | (11,773, 041 | $\begin{array}{r} (234,381) \\ (249,959) \\ (503,418) \\ (12,854,367) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (184,399) \\ (167,589) \\ (1,57,125) \\ (3,696,150) \\ (164,682) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,941,345 \\ 141,719 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,356,666 \\ 300,857 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,149,110 \\ & 3,341,626 \\ & 3,802,655 \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{-}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1418,710) \\ 2,53,509 \\ (379,551) \\ (25,595,047) \\ 10,680) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 851,976 \\ 19,76,500 \\ 12,716,10 \\ 12,357,374 \\ 3,145,509 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26,997 \\ 624,847 \\ 40,798 \\ 3,869,396 \\ 99,639 \end{array}$ | 15, | $\begin{array}{r} 25,997 \\ 641,119 \\ 40,792 \\ 3,869,396 \\ 99,639 \end{array}$ |  |
| Sartell <br> Sauk Rapids <br> Savage <br> Shakopee <br> Sharevien | $\begin{aligned} & 1,906,723 \\ & 4,279,609 \\ & 9,312,616 \\ & 8,644,990 \\ & 3,914,341 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & - \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $(315,769)$ <br> $(613,678)$ <br> $(371,302)$ | $\begin{array}{r} (81,-35) \\ (106,906) \\ (155,754) \end{array}$ | $327,703$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $9,8,34$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{-} \end{aligned}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ (387,300) \\ 327,703 \\ (720,584) \\ (527,556) \end{gathered}$ | 1,902,723 <br> $3,892,309$ $9,640,319$ <br> 7,924, 406 <br> $3 ; 386,785$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60,270 \\ & 123,291 \\ & 305,362 \\ & 251,010 \\ & 107,278 \end{aligned}$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} 60,270 \\ 123,291 \\ 305,352 \\ 251,010 \\ 107,279 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.147 \% \\ & 0.301 \% \\ & 0.745 \% \\ & 0.612 \% \\ & 0.262 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Shorewood <br> South St. Paul <br> Spring Lake Park <br> Stillwater <br> Thief River Falls | $\begin{aligned} & 5,603,047 \\ & 7,532,748 \\ & 1,773,897 \\ & 7,31,537 \\ & 7,208,359 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ {[1,859,660)} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (134,199) \\ (25,951) \\ (45,814) \\ (95,830\} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -- \\ (2,139) \\ (7,532\} \\ (343) \\ (382,862) \end{array}$ | $(38,373)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{Z} \\ & \overline{-} \end{aligned}$ | 104,442 2,269 | $\begin{gathered} (11,288) \\ -- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & - \\ & - \\ & \hline- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (134,199) \\ (27,349) \\ (99,239) \\ (2,585,991) \\ (380,593) \end{array}$ | 5,469,848 <br> 7,260,400 <br> 1,681,650 <br> 6,827,765 | $\begin{aligned} & 173,29 \\ & 295,977 \\ & 53,267 \\ & 146,520 \\ & 215,273 \end{aligned}$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & 173,229 \\ & 695,977 \\ & 5,267 \\ & 146,520 \\ & 215,273 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.423 \% \\ & 0.561 \% \\ & 0.130 \% \\ & 0.357 \% \\ & 0.527 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Yadrais Heights <br> Vinginia <br> Waite Park Haseca <br> West 5t. Feul | $\begin{aligned} & 2,175,077 \\ & 5,579,164 \\ & 5,4,183,189 \\ & 1,762,068 \\ & 4,974,026 \end{aligned}$ | $\bar{Z}$ | $\begin{gathered} (405,932) \\ - \\ (429,250) \\ (146,003) \end{gathered}$ | $(39,403)$ | $\overline{-}$ | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & - \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{-} \\ & \overline{5}, 000 \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{--}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} (405,939) \\ (38,403) \\ (424,350) \\ (146,083) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,769,145 \\ & 5,59,751 \\ & 543,183 \\ & 1,337,818 \\ & 4,847,343 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 56,033 \\ 175,475 \\ 17,206 \\ 4,376 \\ 153,561 \end{gathered}$ | -- | $\begin{gathered} 56,039 \\ 17,475 \\ 17,206 \\ 4,376 \\ 153,561 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.137 \% \\ & 0.428 \% \\ & 0.042 \% \\ & 0.105 \% \\ & 0.375 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| White Bear Lake <br> Willmar <br> Winota <br> Wodbury <br> Warthington | $\begin{gathered} 9,552,505 \\ 3,125,623 \\ 10,19,600 \\ 15,709,59 \\ 5,662,476 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \overline{-} \\ \overline{-} \\ (1,030,707) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \{71,296) \\ (33,694\} \\ (1,04,13) \\ \{639,194\} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (113,789) \\ (360,973) \\ (71,559) \\ (56,959) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $(19,147)$ | -- | $\begin{aligned} & 279,823 \\ & 2,500 \\ & 340,950 \\ & 3,954 \\ & 26,0442 \\ & 26,942 \end{aligned}$ | $(50,418)$ | -- | $\begin{array}{r} (549,261) \\ (38,91) \\ 5,25 \\ (1,075,45) \\ (1,700,018) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9,004,544 \\ 8,36,732 \\ 10,200,856 \\ 15,534,654 \\ 3,965,458 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 285,227 \\ & 285,740 \\ & 353,117 \\ & \hline 955,216 \\ & 125 ; 513 \end{aligned}$ | $27,548$ | $\begin{aligned} & 295,297 \\ & 304,389 \\ & 383,17 \\ & 495,216 \\ & 125,513 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.696 \% \\ & 0.74 \% \\ & 0.798 \% \\ & 1.209 \% \\ & 0.306 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| tate toral | [4,817,385 | 134, 170 | 345, 25 | 6,74 | 101,07 | 438, 4 | 649,3 | 19, | (1, 740,6 | [3, 35,66 |  | 40,907,63 | 692,366 | ,000,00 | . |

[^0]
## Cities with a excess unencumbered balance adjustment

As of September 1, 1991, these cities exceeded the guidelines setforth in the Excess Unencumbered Balance Adjustment Resolution.
THE SCREENING BOARD RESOLUTION STATES:
Whenever a municipality's construction fund balance available as of September 1, of the current year, not including the current years allotment, exceeds $\$ 500,000$ or two times their annual construction allotment (whichever is greater), shall receive an adjustment of two times the amount available (city's unencumbered construction fund balance less the current years construction allotment) will be deducted from the city's twenty-five year needs prior to the suceeding year apportionment.
The adjustment is increased annually to $3,4,5$, etc. until the city does not have an excess.

NOTE:
The June Screening Board increased the $\$ 300,000$ to $\$ 500,000$ effective September 1, 1991 .


* The allowable balance in (C) is two times the construction allotment or $\$ 500,000$ (whichever is greater.)
** The initial loss in apportionment (F) cannot exceed excess balance in (D).
*** Based on the 1991 apportionment $\$ 1000$ of money meeds $=\$ 32.11$

FAL-UNCONBAL
UNENCUMBERED CONSTRUCTION FUND BALANCE ADJUSTMENT
The amount of the unencumbered fund balance as of September 1st of the current year, not including the current year construction apportionment, is deducted from the total needs. See Screening Board resolution.
(A) (-)
(B)
(=)
(C)

| Municipality | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AMOUNT } \\ & \text { AVAILABLE } \\ & 9-1-91 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1991 \\ \text { CONSTRUCTION } \\ \text { ALLOTMENT } \end{gathered}$ | Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance Adjustment | Column DIVIDED COLUMN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | \$1,189,539 | \$546,195 | \$643,344 | 1.18 |
| Alexandria | 404,063 | 281,413 | 122,650 | 0.44 |
| Andover | 317,109 | 419,084 |  | 0.00 |
| Anoka | 464,906 | 341,799 | 123,107 | 0.36 |
| Apple Valley | 741,564 | 822,681 |  | 0.00 |
| Arden Hills |  | 184,508 | -- | 0.00 |
| Austin | 1,549,014 | 823,818 | 725,196 | 0.88 |
| Bemidji | 1,038,068 | 411,327 | 626,741 | 1.52 |
| Blaine | 1,535,212 | 855,880 | 679,332 | 0.79 |
| Bloomington | 4,172,452 | 2,225,659 | 1,946,793 | 0.87 |
| Brainerd | 784,768 | 274,137 | 510,631 | 1.86 |
| Brooklyn Center | 780,493 | 829,821 |  | 0.00 |
| Brooklyn Park | 3,453,875 | 1,078,848 | 2,375,027 | 2.20 |
| Buffalo | 295,672 | 217,738 | 77,934 | 0.36 |
| Burnsville | 624,305 | 870,653 |  | 0.00 |
| Champlin | 113,016 | 270,805 |  | 0.00 |
| Chanhassen | 425,582 | 260,563 | 165,019 | 0.63 |
| Chaska | 503,186 | 261,227 | 241,959 | 0.93 |
| Chisholm | 49,308 | 212,379 | --- | 0.00 |
| Cloquet | 974,904 | 379,056 | 595,848 | 1.57 |
| Columbia Heights | 927,893 | 393,589 | 534,304 | 1.36 |
| Coon Rapids | 1,517,073 | 927,385 | 589,688 | 0.64 |
| Corcoran | 181,563 | 197,839 |  | 0.00 |
| Cottage Grove | 674,098 | 652,488 | 21,610 | 0.03 |
| Crookston |  | 312,541 | 930-971 | 0.00 |
| Crystal | 1,470,740 | 539,769 | 930,971 | 1.72 |
| Detroit Lakes | 1,811 | 216,699 | -- | 0.00 |
| Duluth | 1,434,115 | 2,529,263 | -- | 0.00 |
| EAGAN | 742,833 | 917,604 | -- | 0.00 |
| East Bethel | 68,512 | 178,618 | -- | 0.00 |
| East Grand Forks | 100,551 | 223,666 | -- | 0.00 |
| Eden Prairie | 214,128 | 1,019; 870 |  | 0.00 |
| EDINA | 2,911,521 | 1,125,380 | 1,786,141 | 1.59 |


|  | (A) | (B) | (C) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Municipality | Amount Available 9-1-91 | 1991 CONSTRUCTION <br> Allotment | Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance ADJUSTMENT | Column (C) DIvided By Column (B) |
| Elk River | \$78,458 | \$346,706 | -- | 0.00 |
| Fairmont | 247,384 | 537,198 | -- | 0.00 |
| Falcon Heights | , | 92,894 | -- | 0.00 |
| Faribault | 725,144 | 413,851 | 311, 293 | 0.75 |
| Farmington | 248,820 | 263,361 | -- | 0.00 |
| Fergus Falls | 365,589 | 396,636 | -- | 0.00 |
| Forest Lake | 269,926 | 119,560 | 150,366 | 1.26 |
| Fridley | 1,952,505 | 558,833 | 1,393,672 | 2.49 |
| Golden Valley | 1,560,744 | 771,053 | 1,789,691 | 1.02 |
| Grand Rapids | 455,171 | 287,687 | 167,484 | 0.58 |
| Ham Lake | 616,669 | 193,136 | 423,533 | 2.19 |
| Hastings | 174,148 | 321, 054 | - - | 0.00 |
| Hermantown | 609,885 | 114,498 | 495,387 | 4.33 |
| Hibbing | 372,560 | 743,800 | -- | 0.00 |
| HOPKINS | 396,839 | 384,590 | 12,249 | 0.03 |
| Hutchinson | 734,487 | 274,992 | 459,495 | 1.67 |
| International Falls | 603,643 | 252,386 | 351,257 | 1.39 |
| Inver Grove Heights | 448,166 | 382,379 | 65,787 | 0.17 |
| Lake Elmo | 426,860 | 121,407 | 305,453 | 2.52 |
| Lakeville | 171,516 | 727,348 | -- | 0.00 |
| Lino Lakes | 891,191 | 298,721 | 592,470 | 1.98 |
| Litchfield | 519,393 | 185,868 | 333,525 | 1.79 |
| Little Canada | 8,077 | 75,758 | 181-889 | 0.00 |
| Little Falls | 497,942 | 316,053 | 181,889 | 0.58 |
| Mankato |  |  | 124,230 | 0.15 |
| Maple Grove | 82,362 | 759,888 | 150,-- | 0.00 |
| Maplewood | 1,662,967 | 512,672 | 1,150, 295 | 2.24 |
| Marshall |  |  |  | 1.06 |
| Mendota Heights | 690,208 | 214,481 | 475,727 | 2.22 |
| Minneapolis | 20,027,879 | 8,144,140 | 11,883,739 | 1.46 |
| Minnetonka | 3, 083, 393 | 1,165,247 | 1,918,146 | 1.65 |
| Montevideo | , 429,149 | 173,373 | 255,776 | 1.48 |
| Moorhead | 1,621,584 | 786,243 | 835,341 | 1.06 |
| Morris | 6 | 149,579 | 30- | 0.00 |
| Mound | 496,448 | 191,960 | 304,488 | 1.59 |
| Mounds View | 753,188 | 188,425 | 564,763 | 3.00 |
| New Brighton | 23,263 | 391, 624 | -- | 0.00 |
| New Hope |  | 449,329 | - | 0.00 |
| New Ulm | 173,932 | 373,303 | -- | 0.00 |


|  | (A) | (B) $(=$ | (C) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Municipality | Amount <br> Available $9-1-91$ | $\begin{gathered} 1991 \\ \text { CONSTRUCTION } \\ \text { ALLOTMENT } \end{gathered}$ | Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance AdJustment | Column (C) DIVIDED BY COLUMN (B) |
| Northfield | \$818,197 | \$373,574 | \$444,623 | 1.19 |
| North Mankato | 443,665 | 233,988 | 209,677 | 0.90 |
| North St. Paul | 260,695 | 260,282 | - 413 | 0.00 |
| Oakdale | 5 | 276,761 | , | 0.00 |
| ORONO | 823,540 | 199,986 | 623,554 | 3.12 |
| Otsego | 344,397 | 344,398 | -- | 0.00 |
| Owatonna | 115,632 | 593, 673 | --- | 0.00 |
| Plymouth | 1,610,330 | 965,239 | 645,091 | 0.67 |
| Prior Lake | 600,555 | 325,215 | 275,340 | 0.85 |
| Ramsey | 551,516 | 417,438 | 134,078 | 0.32 |
| Red Wing | 1,017,545 | 484,257 | 533,288 | 1.10 |
| Richfield | 2,028,566 | 726,887 | 1,301,679 | 1.79 |
| Robbinsdale | 1,019,686 | 337,218 | 682,468 | 2.02 |
| Rochester | 3,434,036 | 1,817,135 | 1,616,901 | 0.89 |
| Rosemount |  | 305,704 |  | 0.00 |
| Roseville | 1,483,800 | 779,103 | 704,697 | 0.90 |
| St. Anthony | 374,278 | 139,897 | 234,381 | 1.68 |
| St. Cloud | 1,176,980 | 927,122 | 249,858 | 0.27 |
| St. Louts Park | 1,202,500 | 699,082 | 503,418 | 0.72 |
| St. Paul | 19,092,738 | 6,238,171 | 12,854,567 | 2.06 |
| St. Peter | 226,642 | 226,641 |  | 0.00 |
| Sauk Rapids | 514,709 | 198,940 | 315,769 | 1.59 |
| Savage |  | 275,950 |  | 0.00 |
| Shakopee | 988,852 | 375,174 | 613,678 | 1.64 |
| Shoreview | 739,744 | 367,942 | 371,802 | 1.01 |
| Shorewood | 385,594 | 251,395 | 134,199 | 0.53 |
| South St. Paul | 690,661 | 431,740 | 258,921 | 0.60 |
| Spring Lake Park |  | 89,434 | 45,814 |  |
| Stillwater | 1,279,535 | 349,705 | 929,830 | 2.66 |
| Thief River Falls | 169,570 | 343,286 |  | 0.00 |
| Vadnais Heights | 537,792 | 131,860 | 405,932 | 3.08 |
| Virginia | 31,970 | 254,251 |  | 0.00 |
| Waseca | 594,136 | 164,886 | 429,250 | 2.60 |
| West St. Paul | 563,040 | 416,957 | 146,083 | 0.35 |
| White Bear Lake | 1,159,134 | 444,838 | 714,296 | 1.61 |
| Witlmar | - | 408,666 | -- | 0.00 |
| Winona | 834,924 | 502,230 | 332,694 | 0.66 |
| Woodbury | 1,860,880 | 796,067 | 1,064,813 | 1.34 |
| Worthington | 942,243 | 303,049 | 639,194 | 2.11 |
| TOTAL | \$120,663,647 | \$66,378,603 | \$63,945,255 | 0.96 |

PROJECT LISTING OF MUNICIPAL STATE AID EXPENDITURES ON COUNTY STATE AID OR TRUNK HIGHWAY PROJECTS IN 1990
(For Reference, see Off-system Resolution)

| MUNICIPALITY | PROJECT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { AMOUNT } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL <br> MONEY NEEDS ADJUSTMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALbert Lea | 101-010-02 | \$160 | \$160 |
| Austin | $\begin{aligned} & 104-010-04 \\ & 104-020-08 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,253 \\ & 8,545 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 9,798 | 9,798 |
| Blaine | $\begin{aligned} & 106-020-02 \\ & 106-010-12 \\ & 106-010-13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 67,224 \\ 15,925 \\ 901 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 84,050 | 84,050 |
| Bloomington | 107-020-24 | 24,305 | 24,305 |
| Brooklyn Park | 110-020-02 | 15,054 | 15,054 |
| Burnsville | $179-010-02$ $179-020-05$ | $\begin{aligned} & 473,650 \\ & 399,217 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 872,867 | 872,867 |
| Chaska | $\begin{aligned} & 196-010-08 \\ & 196-010-03 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,418 \\ 8,795 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 24,213 | 24,213 |
| Columbia Heights | 113-010-03 | 23,711 | 23,711 |
| Crystal | 116-020-02 | 81,584 | 81,584 |
| Duluth | $\begin{aligned} & 118-010-18 \\ & 118-020-13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81,475 \\ & 45,125 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 126-600 | 126,600 |
| East Grand Forks | 119-010-01 | 33,750 | 33,750 |
| Edina | 120-020-26 | 430,152 | 430,152 |
| Fridley | 127-020-08 | 17,819 | 17,819 |
| Golden Valley | 128-020-06 | 347,481 | 347,481 |
| Hastings | 130-010-03 | 63,381 | 63,381 |
| Hermantown | 202-020-01 | 35,039 | 35,039 |
| Hopkins | $\begin{aligned} & 132-010-02 \\ & 132-020-05 \\ & 132-020-07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1,487 \\ 13,237 \\ 33,793 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 48,514 | 48,514 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| MUNICIPALITY | PROJECT | PROJECT | MONETAL |
| AMOUNT | ADJUSTMENT |  |  |

AUTHORIZED MUNICIPAL STATE AID EXPENDITURES ON COUNTY STATE AID OR TRUNK HIGHWAY
(For Reference, See Offsystem Resolution)

| MUNICIPALITY | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { EXPEN- } \\ & \text { DITTRES } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1980-1989 \\ & \text { EXPENTTURE } \\ & \text { ADUSTMENT } \end{aligned}$ | (-) ADJUSIRED | $\begin{aligned} & 1992 \\ & \text { APPORTION- } \\ & \text { MENT } \\ & \text { ADJUSTMENT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ä-E---T-E- | \$160 |  | \$279,803 |  | \$279,963 |
| Alexandria | - |  | 161,571 |  | 161, 571 |
| Andover | -- |  | 113,955 | $(\$ 53,713)$ | 113, 383 |
| Apple Valley |  |  | 230,701 |  | 230,701 |
| Arden Hills |  |  | 80,983 |  | 80,983 |
| AUSTIN | 9,798 |  | 675,387 | $(59,981)$ | 625,204 |
| BEMIDJI | 84,050 |  | 250,279 | $(33,927)$ | 300, 402 |
| BLOOMINGTON | 24,305 |  | 3,838, 059 | ( 568,424 ) | 3,293,940 |
| Brainerd |  |  | 40,806 | $(40,806)$ |  |
| BROOKLYN CENTER BROOKLYN PARK | 15,054 |  | 13-156 |  | 28,-210 |
| BufFALO | 872867 |  |  |  |  |
| BURNSVILLE | 872,867 |  | 13,763 |  | 886,630 15,512 |
| Chanhassen |  |  |  |  |  |
| CHASKA | 24,213 |  | 398,913 |  | 423,126 |
| Cloouet |  |  | 30,745 |  | 30,745 |
| COLUMBIA HEIGHTS Coon Rapids | 23,711 |  | 19,436 |  | 19,436 |
| Corcoran |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cottage Grove | - |  | -- |  |  |
| CROOKSTON | 81,584 |  | 31,134 |  | 112,718 |
| DETROIT LAKES | 126,600 |  | 437,866 |  | 564,466 |
| Eagan |  |  |  |  |  |
| EAST BETHEL EAST GRAND Forks | 33,750 |  |  |  |  |
| Eden Prairie | -150 |  | 155,330 |  | 155',330 |
| Edinat | 430,152 |  | 645,157 | $(106,651)$ | 968,658 |
| FAIRMONT | -- |  | -- |  | -- |
| Falcon Heights | - |  | 40,753 | $(3,041)$ | 37,712 |
| FARMINGTON |  |  |  |  | 寿 |
| FErgus Falls | - |  | 128,635 | $(128,635)$ |  |
| FOREST FRIDLEY | 17,-819 |  | 109,-180 |  | 126,999 |
| Golden Valley | 347,481 |  | 128,001 |  | 475, 482 |
| Ham Lake |  |  |  |  |  |
| HAstings | 63,381 |  | 251,582 |  | 314,963 |
| lermantown | 35,039 |  | 107,535 |  | 107, 535 |
| Hopkins | 48,514 |  | 232,192 |  | 288,706 |
| HUTCHINSON |  |  | 273,473 |  | 273,473 |
| Inver Grove Heights | 38,313 |  | 109,852 |  | 148,165 |
| Lake Elmo | -- |  | 1,035,-360 |  | 1,035,360 |
| Lino Lakes | -- |  |  |  |  |


| MUNICIPALITY | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { EXPEN- } \\ & \text { DITTRES } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1980-1989 \\ \text { EXPENTTURE } \\ \text { (+) ADJUSTMENT } \end{array}$ | (-) ADJUSIRENT $=$ | $\begin{gathered} 1992 \\ \text { APPORTION } \\ \text { MENT } \end{gathered}$ ADJUSTMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LItchfield | \$23,442 | \$152,509 |  | \$175,951 |
| Little Canada |  |  |  |  |
| Mittle falls | -- | 745,865 |  | 745,865 |
| Mankato ${ }^{\text {Maple Grove }}$ | -- | 745,896 |  | 745,896 |
| Maplewood |  | 26,978 |  | 26,978 |
| Marshall |  | 11,775 | $(\$ 11,775)$ |  |
| Mendota heights Minneapolis | 448,-641 | 2,366,696 |  | 2,815,736 |
| Minnetonka |  | 3,447,811 | $(177,026)$ | 3,270,785 |
| MONTEVIDO <br> Moorhead | 201, $\overline{\mathbf{2} 50}$ | 81, 325 |  | 282,-575 |
| Morris |  | 187,741 |  | 187, 741 |
| Mound Mounds View | -- | 322,986 |  | 260, 896 |
| NEW Brighton | 701,890 | 1,158, 418 | $(503,396)$ | 1,356', 912 |
| NEW HOPE | 248,981 | 259,468 | $(55,968)$ | 452,481 144,326 |
| Northfield |  | 237,837 |  | 237, 837 |
| North Mankato | 198,-833 | 215,'237 |  | 414,070 |
| Oakdale |  |  |  |  |
| ORONO | -- | 191,624 | $(1,624)$ $(161,444)$ | 190,000 |
| Plymouth | -- | 957,837 |  | 37,837 |
| Prior Lake | - |  |  |  |
| RAMSEY RED WING |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {RED WING }}$ | -- | 69,354 | $(3,161)$ | 66,193 |
| Robbinsdale |  | 73, 487 |  | 73, 487 |
| ROCHESTER | -- | 43,'989 |  | 46,'989 |
| RoSEYILLE |  |  |  |  |
| St. Anthony | -- | 223,789 | $\begin{gathered} (39,460) \\ (149,718) \end{gathered}$ | 184, 329 |
| St. Louis Park | 133,676 | 1,440,449 |  | 1,574,125 |
| St. Paul | 147, ${ }^{1}$, 853 | 3, 634,432 | $(85,566)$ | 3,696,150 |
| Sauk Rapids | 91,-- | 135',926 | $(54,561)$ | 81,365 |
| ${ }_{\text {Savage }}^{\text {Shakopee }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Shakopee | 33-079 | 106,906 |  | 106,906 155,754 |
| SHOREWOOD |  |  |  |  |
| South St Paul | -- | 2,139 |  | 2,139 |
| SPrillwater |  |  |  |  |
| Thief River falls VAdNAIS Heights | =- | 418,993 | $(36,131)$ | 382,862 |
| VIRGINIA | -- | 38,403 |  | 38,403 |
| WASECA Paul |  |  |  |  |
| White bear Lake | 37,406 | 76,382 |  | 113,788 |
| WILLMAR | 123,224 | 391.721 | $(153,972)$ | 360,973 |
| WINONA | -- | 71,-559 |  | 71,559 |
| Worthington | -- | 56,959 |  | 56,959 |
| TOTAL | \$4,666,350 | \$28,269,373 | $(\$ 2,428,980)$ | \$30,506,743 |

(Amount as of December 31, 1990)
(For Reference, see Bond Adjustment Resolution)

Unamortized Bond Balance: The remaining bond principal to be paid on the issue.
Total Disbursements and Obligations: The amount of bond applied toward State Aid projects.
Unencumbered Bond Balance Available: The amount of the bond not applied toward a State Aid project.

The bond account adjustment is computed by using step A and B.
Step A: Amount of issue minus disbursements $=$ unencumbered balance.
Step B: Unamortized bond balance minus unencumbered balance = bond account adjustment.

| Municipality | Date of Issue | Amount of Issue | Unamortized Bond Balance | Total Disbursements and Obligations to December 31, 1990 | Unencumbered Bond Balance Available | Off System Disbursement | Bond <br> Account <br> Adjustment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andover | 9-01-84 | \$510,000 | \$210,000 | \$510,000 | \$0 |  | \$210,000 |
| Andover | 8-01-88 | 500,000 | 400,000 | 500,000 | 0 |  | 400,000 |
| Anoka | 7-01-86 | 985,000 | 630,000 | 0 | 985,000 |  | $(355,000)$ |
| Apple Valley | 4-01-71 | 250,000 | 15,000 | 250,000 | 0 |  | 15,000 |
| Apple Valley | 12-01-74 | 100,000 | 25,000 | 100,000 | 0 |  | 25,000 |
| Apple Valley | 8-01-79 | 875,000 | 630,000 | 875,000 | 0 |  | 630,000 |
| Brainerd | 6-01-74 | 620,000 | 0 | 620,000 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Brainerd | 10-01-85 | 430,000 | 320,000 | 430,000 | 0 |  | 320,000 |
| Brooklyn Center | 9-01-70 | 1,050,000 | 60,000 | 1,050,000 | 0 |  | 60,000 |
| Coon Rapids | 8-01-90 | 1,935,000 | 1,935,000 | 1,328,248 | 606,752 |  | 1,328,248 |
| Cottage Grove | 5-01-77 | 560,000 | 230,000 | 541,186 | 18,814 |  | 211,186 |
| Cottage Grove | 5-01-78 | 610,000 | 0 | 0 | 610,000 |  | $(610,000)$ |
| Duluth | 4-01-85 | 1,425,000 | 0 | 1,425,000 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Eagan | 7-01-86 | 3,000,000 | 2,340,000 | 3,000,000 | 0 |  | 2,340,000 |
| East Grand Forks | 9-01-65 | 325,000 | 75,000 | 325,000 | 0 |  | 75,000 |
| Eden Prairie | 12-01-82 | 2,300,000 | 550,000 | 2,211,663 | 88,337 |  | 461,663 |
| Falcon Heights | 4-21-80 | 170,000 | 0 | 142,012 | 27,988 |  | $(27,988)$ |
| Faribault | 7-01-74 | 550,000 | 0 | 550,000 | 0 |  | 0 |


| Municipality | Date of Issue | Amount of Issue | Unamortized Bond Balance | Total Disbursements and Obligations to December 31, 1990 | Unencumbered Bond Balance Available | Off System Disbursement | Bond <br> Account <br> Adjustment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grand Rapids | 6-01-69 | \$200,000 | \$5,000 | \$200,000 | \$0 |  | \$5,000 |
| Ham Lake | 7-01-80 | 330,000 | 20,000 | 330,000 | 0 |  | 20,000 |
| Hibbing | 9-01-82 | 1,100,000 | 0 | 847,313 | 252,687 |  | $(252,687)$ |
| Little Canada | 10-01-81 | 225,000 | 110,000 | 91,783 | 133,217 |  | $(23,217)$ |
| Little Canada | 8-01-86 | 340,000 | 315,000 | 340,000 | 0 |  | 315,000 |
| Maple Grove | 7-16-79 | 1,100,000 | 0 | 1,080,299 | 19,701 |  | $(19,701)$ |
| Maplewood | 8-01-71 | 540,000 | 45,000 | 540,000 | 0 |  | 45,000 |
| Marshall | 7-01-81 | 310,000 | 0 | 235,496 | 74,504 |  | $(74,504)$ |
| Mendota Heights | 3-01-75 | 360,000 | 140,000 | 360,000 | 0 |  | 140,000 |
| New Hope | 5-14-73 | 101,000 | 0 | 101,000 | 0 | 84,422 | 0 |
| North Mankato | 6-01-86 | 550,000 | 330,000 | 0 | 550,000 |  | $(220,000)$ |
| Orono | 8-01-79 | 270,000 | 0 | 204,747 | 65,253 |  | $(65,253)$ |
| Redwood Falls | 1982 | 215,000 | 65,000 | 0 | 215,000 |  | $(150,000)$ |
| Roseville | 12-01-85 | 2,225,000 | 1,895,000 | 2,225,000 | 0 |  | 1,895,000 |
| St. cloud | 6-01-70 | 1,335,000 | 0 | 1,335,000 | 0 |  | 0 |
| St. Cloud | 7-01-82 | 1,000,000 | 920,000 | 1,000,000 | 0 |  | 920,000 |
| st. cloud | 9-01-83 | 1,645,000 | 1,450,000 | 1,116,945 | 528,055 |  | 921,945 |
| ** St. Paut | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | 141,719 |
| Savage | 10-01-87 | 875,000 | 675,000 | 527,703 | 347,297 |  | 327,703 |
| Spring Lake Park | 1980 | 195,000 | 0 | 156,107 | 38,893 |  | $(38,893)$ |
| Virginia | 2-01-78 | 420,000 | 0 | 420,000 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Woodbury | 11-12-75 | 263,000 | 0 | 243,853 | 19,147 |  | $(19,147)$ |
| * total |  | \$29,579,000 | \$13,325,000 | \$25,213,355 | \$4,365,645 | \$84,422 | \$9,101,074 |

* Since Redwood Falls population dropped below 5000, their bond is not included in the totals.
** St. Paul - Improvement bond issue not included.

To compensate for not allowing needs for non-existing structures in the 25-year needs study, the Municipal Screening Board passed the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED:
"The money needs for all "non-existing" bridges and grade separation be removed from the Needs Study until such time that a construction project is awarded. At that time a money needs adjustment shall be made by annually adding the total amount of the structure cost that is eligible for State Aid reimbursement for a $15-$ Year period."

| Munictipality | First Year OF Adjustment | Year of Apportionment Expiration | Amount |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | 1978 | 1992 | \$245,320 |
| Bloomington | 1987 \& 1990 | 2001 \& 2004 | 2,326,375 |
| Burnsville | 1986 | 2000 | 349,684 |
| * Duluth | 1987 | 2001 | 1,054,200 |
| Eden Prairie | 1985 | 1999 | 974,299 |
| Grand Rapids | 1980 | 1994 | 553,858 |
| Hastings | 1983 | 1997 | 233,038 |
| Hutchinson | 1980 | 1994 | 570,793 |
| Minneapolis | 1983 \& 1986 | 1997 \& 2000 | 1,493,191 |
| Red Wing | 1980 \& 1986 | 1994 \& 2000 | 1,145,475 |
| Roseville | 1987 | 2001 | 2,814,714 |
| St. Louis Park | 1980 | 1994 | 1,356,666 |
| St. Paul | 1983 | 1997 | 320,857 |
| TOTAL |  |  | \$13,438,470 |
| * Rehabilittation <br> Screening Board | HE LIFT BRIDG 1986. | CH WAS APPROVE | by the |


| MUNICIPALITY | PROJECT | PROJECT AMOUNT | TOTAL ADJUSTMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andover | $\begin{aligned} & 198-114-02 \\ & 198-115-02 \\ & 198-117-01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 18,905 \\ 121,267 \\ 7,111 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 147,283 | \$147,283 |
| Blaine | 106-101-04 | 71, 141 | 71,141 |
| Brooklyn Center | $\begin{aligned} & 109-104-01 \\ & 109-105-01 \\ & 109-106-02 \\ & 109-111-13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} (600) \\ (7,825) \\ (250) \\ 60,900 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 52,225 | 52,225 |
| Burnsville | $\begin{aligned} & 179-123-01 \\ & 179-123 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 369,759 \\ 41,300 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 411,059 | 411,059 |
| Chanhassen Chaska | $\begin{aligned} & 194-110-01 \\ & 196-110-01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 65,000 \\ 9,901 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 65,000 \\ 9,901 \end{array}$ |
| Cottage Grove | $\begin{aligned} & 180-102-10 \\ & 180-103-01 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54,184 \\ & 11,919 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 66,103 | 66,103 |
| East Bethel | 203-101-03 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Ham Lake | $\begin{aligned} & 197-114-01 \\ & 197-114-02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7,111 \\ 18,905 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 26,016 | 26,016 |
| Mankato | 137-122-01 | 42,305 | 42,305 |
| Maple Grove | $\begin{aligned} & 189-101 \\ & 189-106 \\ & 189-109 \\ & 189-115 \\ & 189-125 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 14,810 \\ 9,243 \\ 75,027 \\ 120,233 \\ 42,275 \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | 261,588 | 261,588 |
| Ramsey | $\begin{aligned} & 199-110-03 \\ & 199-112-02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30,491 \\ & 60,482 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 90,973 | 90,973 |
| Rochester <br> st. Cloud | $\begin{aligned} & 159-114-09 \\ & 162-108-13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130,645 \\ & 363,287 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130,645 \\ & 363,287 \end{aligned}$ |
| St. Louis Park | $\begin{aligned} & 163-275-07 \\ & 163-276-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 866 \\ & 440 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 1,306 | 1,306 |
| st. Paul | 164-125-21 | 282,578 | 282,578 |
| Total |  |  | \$2,023,410 |

NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY ACOUISITION
(For reference, see Right-of-Way Resolution)

| MUNICIPALITY | $\begin{gathered} 1979-1989 \\ \text { EXENDITURES } \\ \text { TOTAL NEEDS } \\ \text { ADUSTMENT FOR } \\ 1991 \text { APPORT. } \end{gathered}$ | (+) | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ & \text { EXPENDI- } \\ & \text { TURES } \end{aligned}$ | (=) | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { RIGHT-OF-AWAY } \\ \text { ADJUSTMENT } \\ \text { FDR } 1922 \\ \text { APPORTIONMENT } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea |  |  | -- |  |  |
| Alexandria |  |  |  |  |  |
| ANDOVER | \$28,974 |  | \$147,283 |  | \$147,283 |
| Apple Valley |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arden Hills |  |  |  |  |  |
| AUSTIN | 148,479 |  |  |  | 148,479 |
| BLAINE | 148,479 |  | 71,141 |  | 71, 141 |
| Bloomington | 832,491 |  |  |  | 832,491 |
| Brooklyn Center | 23,875 |  | 52,225 |  | 76,100 |
| Brooklyn Park | 6,632 |  |  |  | 6,632 |
| BurNSVILLE | 519,647 |  | 411,059 |  | 930,706 |
| Champlin | 95,544 |  |  |  | 95, 5 |
| CHANHASSEN | 82,566 |  | 65,901 |  | 652,467 |
| Chisholm |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cloouet | 73,539 |  | -- |  | 73,539 |
| Columbia Heights Coon Rapids | 535, 5089 |  | -- |  | 535,500 |
| Corcoran | 53,08 |  |  |  |  |
| Cottage Grove |  |  | 66,103 |  |  |
| Crookston | 3, ${ }^{1}, 10819,538$ |  | -- |  | 1,108, ${ }^{1} 219,278$ |
| Detroit Lakes |  |  |  |  |  |
| Duluth | 175,250 |  | -- |  | 175,250 |
| EASAN Eethel | 392,508 |  | 2,000 |  | 392,508 |
| EAST GRAND Forks | 121,700 |  |  |  | 121,700 |
| EDin ${ }^{\text {EDINA }}$ | 45,296 |  | -- |  | 45,296 |
| Elk River | 8,000 |  | -- |  | 8,000 |
| FAIRMONT FALCON Heights | 23,-732 |  | -- |  | 23,732 |
| Faribault | 2,346 |  | -- |  | 2,346 |
| FARMINGTON | 67, 200 |  | -- |  | 67,200 |
|  | 67,20 |  |  |  | 67,200 |
| Fridley GOLDEN Valley | 1, 440,853 |  | -- |  | 1,140, ${ }^{5,825}$ |
| Golden Valley | 1,140,625 |  |  |  | 1,140,625 |
| Ham Lake |  |  | 26,016 |  | 26,016 |
| HASTINGS | 17,620 |  | -- |  | 17,620 |
| Hermantown Hibbing | 78,725 |  | -- |  | 78,725 |
| Hopkins |  |  |  |  |  |
| HUTCHINSON | -- |  |  |  |  |
| InTERNATIONAL FALLS | 617,797 |  | -- |  |  |
| Lake elmo | 99,556 |  | -- |  | 99,556 |
| Lakevilile | 64,950 |  | -- |  | 64,950 |
| Litchfield | -- |  | -- |  |  |



IF, DURING THE PERIOD THAT COMPLETE NEEDS ARE BEING RECIEVED THE STREET IS IMPROVED WITH A BITUMINOUS OVERLAY OR CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR THE MUNICIPALITY WILL CONTINUE TO RECEIVE COMPLETE NEEDS BUT SHALL HAVE THE NON-LOCAL COST OF THE BITUMINOUS RESURFACING OR CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DEDUCTED FROM ITS tOTAL NEEDS FOR A PERIOD OF TEN YEARS.

| MUNICIPALITY | IMPROVEMENT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { NUMBER } \end{aligned}$ | MONEY NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED IN 1990 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ANOKA | BIT OVERLAY | 103-125-06 | \$14, 214 |
| BLOOMINGTON | BIT OVERLAY <br> BIT OVERLAY <br> BIT OVERLAY <br> BIT OVERLAY | $\begin{aligned} & 107-132-15 \\ & 107-384-03 \\ & 107-420-07 \\ & 107-439-01 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  | 66,884 |
| COLUMBIA HEIGHTS | bIt OVERLAY <br> bit OVERLAY | $\begin{aligned} & 113-105-02 \\ & 113-104-07 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,156 \\ 34,801 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  | 50,957 |
| CRYSTAL | bit overlay | 116-325-01 | 8,257 |
| DULUTH | CONC. JOINT REPAIR | 118-155-05 | 164,461 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | CONC. JOINT REPAIR | 141-272-06 | 71,714 |
| MOORHEAD | BIT OVERLAY | 144-107-01 | 15,948 |
| NEW HOPE | bit overlay | 182-101-05 | 146,236 |
| NORTH ST PAUL | CONC. JOINT REPAIR | 151-248-08 | 278,676 |
| ROCHESTER | bit overlay | 159-133-03 | 92,851 |
| TOTAL |  |  | \$910,198 |

## TOTAL NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR <br> BITUMINOUS OVERLAY AND CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR PROJECTS

IF, DURING THE PERIOD THAT COMPLETE NEEDS ARE BEING RECIEVED THE STREET IS IMPROVED WITH A BITUMINOUS OVERLAY OR CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR THE MUNICIPALITY WILL CONTINUE TO RECEIVE COMPLETE NEEDS BUT SHALL HAVE THE NON-LOCAL COST OF THE BITUMINOUS RESURFACING OR CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DEDUCTED FROM ITS TOTAL NEEDS FOR A PERIOD OF TEN YEARS.

| MUNICIPALITY | $\begin{gathered} 1989 \\ \text { EXPENDITURES } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1990 \\ &+\quad \text { EXPENDITURES } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR THE 1992 APPORTIONMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALEXANDRIA | \$85,966 | -- | \$85,966 |
| ANOKA | -- | \$14, 214 | 14,214 |
| BLOOMINGTON | -- | 66,884 | 66,884 |
| COLUMBIA HEIGHTS | 146,361 | 50,957 | 197,318 |
| CRYSTAL | -- | 8,257 | 8,257 |
| DULUTH | 298,392 | 164,461 | 462,853 |
| FERGUS FALLS | 40,902 | -- | 40,902 |
| HERMANTOWN | 182,219 | -- | 182,219 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | -- | 71,714 | 71,714 |
| MOORHEAD | 157,242 | 15,948 | 173,190 |
| NEW HOPE | 28,596 | 146,236 | 174,832 |
| NORTH ST PAUL | -- | 278,676 | 278,676 |
| ROCHESTER | 77,660 | 92,851 | 170,511 |
| ST.PAUL | 230,500 | -- | 230,500 |
| SO. ST. PAUL | 11,288 | -- | 11,288 |
| WILLMAR | 50,418 | -- | 50,418 |
|  | - |  |  |
| TOTAL | \$1,309,544 | \$910,198 | \$2,219,742 |

The resolution states:
That the State Aid Office give future money needs based on the date of variance approval.

The adjustment for width variances will be based on the needs cost of the base and surface, times the proportional difference between the minimum standards and the granted variance, times fifteen or the proportional difference between average past 15 years of base and surface needs received and the granted variance times fifteen (Documentation furnished by the City). This would be a one-year adjustment to the 25 year needs.

Summary of the 34 variances include 13 that do not require a needs adjustment, 5 that require an adjustment, 2 that were denied and 14 that require a hold harmless resolution.

## VARIANCES THAT REOUIRE A NEEDS ADJUSTMENT:

Crystal (91-4) (Received Needs for 52')
Petition of the City of Crystal for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 313 ( 36 th Avenue North) between Douglas Drive and Welcome Avenue, so as to permit a street width of 48 feet instead of the required minimum of 52 feet; four traffic lanes with no parking allowed on either side.

Segment 020

| Base | $\$ 106,816$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Surface | $\frac{117,109}{}$ | Width required <br> Variance width |
|  | $\$ 223,925$ | Adjustment width |

$\$ 223,925 \mathrm{X} \quad \frac{4^{\prime}}{52^{\prime}} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad 15=\$ 537,420$ needs adjustment.

Fairmont (91-8)
Petition of the City of Fairmont for a variance from rule as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 111 (Blue Earth Avenue) between prairie Avenue and Trunk Highway 15, so as to permit a street width of 56 feet instead of the required minimum of 62 feet; four traffic lanes with parking allowed on one side.

Segment 071
Base
Surface

| Base | $\$ 197,308$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Surface | 172,400 |
| $\$ 364,708$ |  |

Width required 62'
Variance width
Adjustment width $\frac{56^{\prime}}{6^{\prime}}$ Adjustment width
$\$ 364,708 \mathrm{X} \frac{6^{\prime}}{62^{\prime}} \mathrm{X} \quad 15=\$ 529,415$ needs adjustment.

Falcon Heights (91-1)
Petition of the city of Falcon Heights for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 101 (Arona Street) from Crawford Avenue to Roselawn Avenue and on MSAS 102 (Albert Street) from Larpenteur Avenue to Garden Avenue, so as to permit a street width of 34 feet instead of the required minimum of 40 feet; for two traffic lanes and parking on both sides.
(Received Needs for $44^{\prime}$ ) (Received Needs for $40^{\prime}$ )

| Segment 040 |  |  | Segment 050 | Width required Variance width | $40^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $34^{1}$ |
| Base | \$21, 264 |  | \$28,456 | Adjustment width | $6^{1}$ |
| surface | 15,463 |  | 20,704 |  |  |
|  | \$37,727 | $+$ | \$49,160 = | \$86,887 |  |

$\$ 86,887 \mathrm{X} \frac{6^{\prime}}{40^{\prime}} \mathrm{X} \quad 15=\$ 195,496$ needs adjustment.

Hopkins (90-38)
Petition of the City of Hopkins for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 341 (Main Street) from Shady Oak Road to 5 th Avenue so as to permit a street width of 46 feet, two traffic lanes and two parking lanes, instead of the required minimum of 48 feet, two traffic lanes and two parking lanes between intersections and to permit a street width of 32 feet, two traffic lanes and no parking lanes instead of the required minimum of 36 feet, two traffic lanes and no parking lanes, at intersection node areas.
(Received Needs for $50^{\prime}$ ) (Received Needs for $52^{\prime}$ )

| Segment 010 |  |  | Segment 020 | Width required 48' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Variance width 46' |
| Base | \$ 64,216 |  | \$101,845 | Adjustment width $2^{\prime}$ |
| Surface | 56,090 |  | 88, 984 |  |
|  | \$120,306 | $+$ | \$190,829 | 111, 135 |

$\$ 311,135 \times \frac{2^{\prime}}{48^{\prime}} \times 15=\$ 194,459$ needs adjustment.

## Owatonna (91-6)

Petition of the City of Owatonna for a variance from rule as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 109 (Bridge Street) between Walnut Avenue and I-35 and on MSAS 110 (Main Street) between Oak Avenue and Bridge Street, so as to permit a street width of 48 feet instead of the required minimum of 52 feet; four traffic lanes with no parking allowed on either side.
(Received Needs for $48^{\prime}$ on segment 020, 030, 040)
(Received Needs for 52' for segment 050)

| Segment | $\underline{020}$ | $\underline{030}$ | $\underline{040}$ | $\underline{050}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base | $\$ 55,061$ | $\$ 34,414$ | $\$ 12,055$ | $\$ 16,080$ |
| Surface | 62,006 |  |  |  |
|  | $\$ 117,067$ | $+\frac{38,771}{73,185}+\frac{13,560}{\$ 25,615}+\frac{14,063}{\$ 30,143}=\$ 246,010$ |  |  |

Width Required 52'
Variance Width
Adjustment Width $\quad \frac{48^{\prime}}{4!}$
$\$ 246,010 \times \frac{41}{52^{\prime}} \times 15=\$ 283,858$ needs adjustment.

APPROVED VARIANCES THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A NEEDS ADJUSTMENT:

## Albert Lea (91-5)

Petition of the City of Albert Lea for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 128 (Sunset Street) between Luther Place and Lakeview Boulevard, so as to permit a design speed of 27 miles per hour for one vertical curve at engineers station $7+50$ and to permit a design speed of 20 miles per hour for one vertical curve at engineers station $10+06$ instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour; and to permit a right of way width of 56.59 feet instead of the required minimum width of 60 feet.

Morris (91-10)
Petition of the City of Morris for a variance on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 103 (Wyoming and Park Avenues) between 5th Street West and Pacific Avenue, so as to permit a design speed of 20 miles per hour for one horizontal curve at 8 th Street instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

Petition of the City of Mound for a variance from minimum standards for a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 101 (Tuxedo Boulevard) between Clyde Road and CSAH 125, so as to permit a design speed of 25 miles per hour instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour from engineer's station $11+66$ to $21+07$ for one sag vertical curve, one crest vertical curve and two horizontal curves.

Mounds View (91-22)
Petition of the City of Mounds View for a variance from Minnesota Rules so as to permit the City of Mounds View to increase their 1991 Maintenance Allotment by $\$ 52,399$. The monies transferred from their State Aid Construction Account to their State Aid Maintenance Account.

Prior Lake (90-37)
Petition of the City of Prior Lake for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a sidewalk project on MSAS 105 (Fish Point Road) from Huron Street to Glory Circle so as to permit a design speed of 28 miles per hour for one horizontal curve and 27.8 miles per hour on four vertical curves instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

Red Wing (89-24)
Petition of the City of Red Wing for a variance from minimum standards for diagonal parking on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 103 (Bush Street) from 4th Street to 5th Street in the City of Red Wing, so as to permit 45 degree angle parking with a traffic isle of 13.2 feet instead of the required traffic isle width of 25.2 feet.

Red Wing (90-4)
Petition of the City of Red Wing for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed sidewalk construction project on MSAS 127 (Twin Bluff Road) from Maple Street to Spruce Drive, so as to permit the use of State Aid funds to construct a sidewalk on Twin Bluff Road which is 40 feet wide instead of the required 44 feet for two through lanes and two no parking lanes.

Red Wing (90-5)
Petition of the City of Red Wing for a variance from minimum standards for a proposed sidewalk construction project on MSAS 109 (Maple Street) from West Avenue/Twin Bluff Road to Mason Street, so as to permit the use of State Aid funds to construct a sidewalk on Maple Street which is 30 feet wide instead of the required minimum of 34 feet for two through lanes and one parking lane.

## Red Wing (90-40)

Petition of the City of Red Wing for a variance from State Aid requirement that a street must meet State Aid standards when using State Aid funds to construct sidewalk and from the requirement that only plans approved by the State Aid Engineer prior to award of contract are eligible for State Aid construction funds for a sidewalk construction project on MSAS 127 (West Avenue/Twin Bluff Road), MSAS 109 (Maple Street), MSAS 124 (Pioneer Road) and MSAS 128 (Featherstone Road).

## Rochester (90-16)

Petition of the City of Rochester for a variance from minimum standards for a proposed sidewalk construction project on MSAS 133 (Elton Hills Drive) between Third Avenue NW and 5th Avenue NW, so as to permit a street width of 60 feet; four traffic lanes and two parking lanes instead of the required minimum of 66 feet.

Rochester (90-17)
Petition of the City of Rochester for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed sidewalk construction project on MSAS 106 (2nd Street SW) between 11th Avenue SW and 13th Avenue SW, so as to permit a street width of 52 feet; four traffic lanes and one parking lane instead of the required minimum of 56 feet.

St. Louis Park (90-39)
Petition of the City of St. Louis Park for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed bridge replacement project on MSAS 280 (Yosemite Avenue) over Minnehaha Creek (Bridge NO. 92686) so as to permit a design speed of 20 miles per hour for one horizontal curve instead of the required design speed of 30 miles per hour.

Stillwater (91-20)
Petition of the City of Stillwater for a variance on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 104 (Myrtle Street) between North 3rd Street and Main Street and on MSAS 106 (2nd Street) between Chestnut Street and Mulberry Street, so as to permit a right of way width of 50 feet instead of the required minimum of 60 feet; and for a variance from 8820.2800 which is the requirement that only those projects for which plans are approved by the State Aid Engineer prior to the award of contract are eligible for State Aid construction funds.

VARIANCES FOR WHICH A HOLD HARMLESS RESOLUTION WAS NOT RECEIVED
(Screening Board recommended that a hold harmless resolution be on file in the State Aid office before a variance is considered for an adjustment)

## Columbia Heights (88-31)

Petition of the City of Columbia Heights for a variance from minimum standards for a bituminous surfacing project on MSAS 104 (44th Avenue N.E.) from 760 feet east of Central Avenue N.E. to McLeod Street.

Mankato (91-9)
Petition of the City of Mankato for a variance from rule as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 106 (North 4th Street) between Madison Avenue and May Street, so as to permit a one way street width of 40 feet instead of the required minimum of 43 feet; two traffic lanes and parking lanes allowed on both sides.

Minneapolis (90-14)
Petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards for a proposed reconstruction project on CSAH 25 (West Lake Street) between Excelsior Boulevard and France Avenue South in Hennepin County, so as to permit a street width of 56 feet with no parking on either side instead of the required minimum width of 58 feet with no parking on either side.

Minneapolis (91-14)
Petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 225 ( 12 Street South) between 3rd Avenue South and 4th Avenue South and the Freeway Entrance so as to permit design speeds of 25 , 15 and 15 miles per hour for three horizontal curves instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

Minneapolis (91-15)
Petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 218 (5th Street North) from 200 feet south of Second Avenue North and Second Avenue North, so as to permit a design speed and posted speed of 25 miles per hour instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

Minneapolis (90-43)
Petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 160 (Bloomington Avenue South) from Lake to East 38th Street, so as to permit a street width of 42 feet instead of the required minimum of 48 feet for two traffic lanes and two parking lanes.

## Minneapolis (90-44)

Petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on Hennepin County State Highway 20 and 38 (West 36th Street) from East Calhoun Parkway to Dupont Avenue South so as to permit a street width of 50 feet; for three traffic lanes and one parking lane instead of the required minimum of 62 feet; for four traffic lanes and one parking lane.

Minneapolis (90-45)
Petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 218 (Fifth Street North) from Hennepin Avenue to Second Avenue North, so as to permit a street width of 37 feet instead of the required minimum of 40 feet for three traffic lanes and no parking lanes for this one way street.

## Minneapolis (90-46)

petition of the City of Minneapolis for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 382 (Market Plaza) from West Lake Street to Excelsior Boulevard, so as to permit a design speed of 20 miles per hour instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

New Ulm (91-18)
Petition of the City of New Ulm for a variance from minimum standards as they apply to a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 115 (North Broadway) between 22nd North Street and Milford Township Road T119, so as to permit a 15 inch clearance from the face of the curb to fixed objects instead of the required minimum of two feet.

St. Paul (89-2)
Petition of the City of St. Paul for a variance from minimum standards for a construction project which has been completed but final is withheld on MSAS 126 (Chesnut Street) between West Seventh Street and Smith Avenue, so as to permit three fixed objects (Utility poles) within the two foot clear zone instead of maintaining the required clear zone free of any fixed objects, thereby approving the project for final payment.

St. Paul (89-4)
Petition of the City of St. Paul for a variance from minimum standards for a construction project which has been completed on MSAS 260 (Burlington Road) between Springfield Road and Totem Road, so as to permit parking on both sides of the street instead of restricting parking to the southwesterly side of the street as required.

## St. Paul (90-41)

Petition of the City of St. Paul for a variance from minimum standards for a proposed reconstruction project on Ramsey County State Aid Highway 64 (Prosperity Avenue) between Rose Avenue and Maryland Avenue, so as to permit a design speed of 20 miles per hour for one horizontal curve instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

Stillwater (90-47)
Petition of the City of Stillwater for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 105 (Mulberry Street) between North Everett Street and North 4 th Street, so as to permit a design speed of less than the minimum for six vertical curves; three curve lengths of 50 feet, two curve lengths of 25 feet and one curve length of 100 feet instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

## VARIANCES THAT WERE DENIED

## Duluth (90-42)

Petition of the City of Duluth for a variance from the requirement that a street must meet State Aid requirements when using State Aid funds to construct a sidewalk and from the requirement that only those projects for which plans are approved by the State Aid Engineer prior to the award of contract or approval of a force account agreement are eligible for state aid construction funds for a sidewalk construction project on MSAS 111 (46th Avenue West) from lst Street to Grand Avenue.

```
St. Paul (91-3)
```

Petition of the City of St. Paul for a variance from minimum standards on a proposed reconstruction project on MSAS 159 (Lexington Parkway South) from University Avenue to St. Clair Avenue, so as to permit a street width of 60 feet instead of the required minimum of 70 feet for four traffic lanes, no parking lanes and a 16 foot median between University Avenue and Summit Avenue; and to permit a street width of 42 feet, two traffic lanes and two parking lanes with parking banned between 7:00-9:00 a.m. and 4:00-6:00 p.m.; between St Clair Avenue and Lincoln Avenue; and to permit a street width of 42 feet, two traffic lanes and two parking lanes with parking banned between 7:00-9:00 a.m. and 4:006:00 p.m. on the west side and with parking banned between 7:009:00 a.m. and 3:00-6:00 on the east side; between Lincoln Avenue and Grand Avenue; and to permit a street width of 42 feet, four traffic lanes and no parking lanes; between Grand Avenue and Summit Avenue instead of the required minimum of 52 feet, four traffic lanes and no parking lanes, or 72 feet, four traffic lanes and two parking lanes.

## TRUNK HIGHWAY TURNBACKS

The following tabulation shows the Trunk Highway Turnback Maintenance allowance for the 1991 Apportionment. All turnbacks eligible for maintenance payments are included in this tabulation as of October 1, 1991. The total turnback maintenance apportionment has been computed in accordance with the 1967 Screening Board Resolution. (See Trunk Highway Turnback resolution.)


## Brooklyn Park



Champlin



The following tabulation shows each municipality's tentative money NEEDS AND POPULATION APPORTIONMENT AMOUNTS FOR 1992. THE TENTATIVE PERCENTAGES SHOWN IN THIS SUMMARY ARE FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

The actual revenue will be announced in January, 1992, when the Commissioner of Transportation determines the annual Municipal State Aid Allotment.

| Municipalities | Population APPORTIONMENT | Money Needs APPORTIONMENT | Total ApportionMENT | Distribution Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | \$267,867 | \$293,498 | \$561,365 | 0.6846\% |
| Alexandria | 114,666 | 207,385 | 322,052 | $0.3927 \%$ |
| Andover | 222,603 | 423,720 | 646,324 | 0.7882\% |
| Anoka | 251,511 | 158,792 | 410, 304 | 0.5004\% |
| Apple Valley | 506,154 | 427,622 | 933,776 | 1.1388\% |
| Arden Hills | 134,577 | 70,298 | 204,876 | 0.2498\% |
| Austin | 320,490 | 486,772 | 807,262 | 0.9845\% |
| Bemidju | 164,509 | 261,600 | 426,109 | 0.5196\% |
| Blaine | 570,187 | 358,763 | 928,950 | 1.1329\% |
| Bloomington | 1,263,043 | 1,779,484 | 3,042,527 | 3.7104\% |
| Brainerd | 180,719 | 178,482 | 359,201 | $0.4381 \%$ |
| Brooklyn Center | 422,604 | 409,539 | 832,143 | 1.0148\% |
| Brooklyn Park | 824,829 | 292,945 | 1,117,774 | 1.3631\% |
| Buffalo | 100,300 | 140,092 | 240,392 | 0.2932\% |
| Burnsville | 750,321 | 563,360 | 1,313,681 | 1.6021\% |
| Cambridge | 74,523 | 26,229 | 100,752 | 0.1229\% |
| Champlin | 246,493 | 155,322 | 401, 815 | $0.4900 \%$ |
| Chanhassen | 171,634 | 184,558 | 356,192 | 0.4344\% |
| Chaska | 165,885 | 138,890 | 304,774 | $0.3717 \%$ |
| Chisholm | 77,390 | 122,036 | 199,426 | $0.2432 \%$ |
| Cloquet | 159,243 | 349,958 | 509,200 | 0.6210 \% |
| Columbia Heights |  | 191,666 | 468,311 | $0.5711 \%$ |
| Coon Rapids | 775,045 | 497,861 | 1,272,906 | 1.5523\% |
| Corcoran | 76,059 | 173,616 | 249,675 | 0.3045 \% |
| Cottage Grove | 335,529 | 387,657 | 723,186 | 0.8819\% |
| Crookston | 118,777 | 218,684 | 337,461 | 0.4115\% |
| Crystal | 348,008 | 372,335 | 720,343 | 0.8785\% |
| Detroit Lakes | 97,067 | 126,222 | 223,289 | 0.2723\% |
| Duluth | 1,250,725 | 1,927,109 | 3,177,834 | 3.8754\% |
| Eagan | 693,573 | 564,466 | 1,258,039 | 1.5342\% |
| East Bethel | 117,768 | 102,143 | 219,911 | 0.2682\% |
| East Grand Forks | 126,663 | 105,736 | 232,398 | $0.2834 \%$ |
| Eden Prairie | 575,103 | 717,634 | 1,292,736 | 1.5765\% |


| Municipalities | Population APPORTIONMENT | Money Needs APPORTIONMENT | Total APPORTIONMENT | Distribution Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EdInA | \$673,984 | \$541, 283 | \$1,215, 267 | 1.4820\% |
| Elk River | 163,017 | 269,751 | 432,769 | 0.5278\% |
| FAIRMONT | 164,802 | 380,172 | 544,974 | $0.6646 \%$ |
| Falcon Heights | 78,707 | 15,024 | 93.731 | $0.1143 \%$ |
| Faribault | 249,946 | 332,389 | 582,335 | $0.7102 \%$ |
| Farmington | 86,900 | 219,014 | 305,914 | $0.3731 \%$ |
| Fergus Falls | 180,851 | 246,478 | 427,329 | $0.5211 \%$ |
| Forest Lake | 85,334 | 81,682 | 167,016 | $0.2037 \%$ |
| Fridley | 414,529 | 180,270 | 594,799 | $0.7254 \%$ |
| Golden Valley | 306,797 | 458, 340 | 765,137 | 0.9331\% |
| Grand Rapids | 116,685 | 168,471 | 285,156 | $0.3478 \%$ |
| Ham Lake | 130,554 | 99,331 | 229,885 | $0.2803 \%$ |
| Hastings | 225,954 | 147,755 | 373,708 | $0.4557 \%$ |
| Hermantown | 98,910 | 191,858 | 290,769 | $0.3546 \%$ |
| Hibbing | 264,005 | 683,572 | 947,577 | 1.1556\% |
| Hopkins | 241,885 | 161,661 | 403,546 | 0.4921\% |
| Hutchinson | 168,576 | 157,241 | 325,818 | 0.3973\% |
| International Falls | 121,791 | 145,808 | 267,599 | $0.3263 \%$ |
| Inver Grove Heights | 328,829 | 278,305 | 607,134 | $0.7404 \%$ |
| Lake Elmo | 86,358 | 81,723 | 168,081 | 0.2050\% |
| Lakeville | 363,603 | 603,192 | 966,795 | 1.1790\% |
| Lino Lakes | 128,843 | 205,945 | 334,788 | $0.4083 \%$ |
| Litchfield | 88,377 | 106,527 | 194,904 | $0.2377 \%$ |
| Little Canada | 131,242 | 82,704 | 213,946 | 0.2609\% |
| Little Falls | 105,801 | 209,966 | 315,767 | 0.3851\% |
| Mahtomedi | 81,472 | 58,139 | 139,611 | $0.1703 \%$ |
| Mankato | 460,495 | 488,168 | 948,663 | 1.1569\% |
| Maple Grove | 566,691 | 656,056 | 1,222,747 | 1.4912\% |
| Maplewood | 452,843 | 201,381 | 654,225 | 0.7978\% |
| Marshall | 175,891 | 91,778 | 267,670 | $0.3264 \%$ |
| Mendota Heights | 137,971 | 120,815 | 258,786 | 0.3156\% |
| Minneapolis | 5,389,281 | 5,091,077 | 10,480,359 | 12.7809\% |
| Minnetonka | 707,632 | 680,924 | 1,388,555 | 1.6934\% |
| Montevideo | 80,448 | 83,043 | 163,490 | $0.1994 \%$ |
| Moorhead | 472,462 | 368,913 | 841,374 | 1.0261\% |
| Morris | 82,116 | 75,396 | 157,512 | 0.1921\% |
| Mound | 140,941 | 85,207 | 226,148 | 0.2758\% |
| Mounds View | 183,469 | 6,841 | 190,310 | 0.2321\% |
| New Brighton | 324,879 | 170,107 | 494,985 | 0.6036\% |
| New Hope | 319,700 | 244,720 | 564,420 | 0.6883\% |
| New Ulm | 192,115 | 235,338 | 427,454 | 0.5213\% |
| Northfield | 214,820 | 200,022 | 414,842 | 0.5059\% |


| Municipalities | Population ApportionMENT | Money Needs APPORTIONMENT | TOtal APPORTIONMENT | Distribution Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Mankato | \$148, 695 | \$108,541 | \$257, 236 | 0.3137\% |
| North St. Paul | 181, 055 | 72,632 | 253,687 | $0.3094 \%$ |
| Oakdale | 268,804 | 224,071 | 492,874 | 0.6011\% |
| Orono | 106,576 | 133,782 | 240,358 | $0.2931 \%$ |
| Otsego | 76,352 | 256,258 | 332,610 | $0.4056 \%$ |
| OWATONNA | 283,609 | 332,298 | 615,907 | 0.7511\% |
| Plymouth | 744,484 | 656,952 | 1,401,435 | 1.7091\% |
| Prior Lake | 167,977 | 190,921 | 358,897 | $0.4377 \%$ |
| Ramsey | 181, 524 | 259,634 | 441,157 | 0.5380\% |
| Red Wing | 221,404 | 430,348 | 651,752 | 0.7948\% |
| Richfield | 522,422 | 509,328 | 1,031,750 | 1.2582\% |
| Robbinsdale | 210,607 | 125,755 | 336,362 | $0.4102 \%$ |
| Rochester | 1,038,655 | 1,046,446 | 2,085,101 | 2.5428\% |
| Rosemount | 126,136 | 276,117 | 402,253 | 0.4906\% |
| Roseville | 489,871 | 371,528 | 861,399 | 1.0505\% |
| St. Anthony | 113,043 | 26,987 | 140,029 | $0.1708 \%$ |
| St. Cloud | 714,098 | 641,119 | 1,355,217 | 1.6527\% |
| St. Louis Park | 640,585 | 402,792 | 1,043,377 | 1.2724\% |
| St. Paul | 3,982,678 | 3,869,396 | 7,852,074 | 9.5757\% |
| St. Peter | 137,825 | 99,639 | 237,464 | $0.2896 \%$ |
| Sartell | 78,897 | 60,270 | 139,167 | 0.1697\% |
| Sauk Rapids | 114,476 | 123,291 | 237,767 | 0.2900\% |
| Savage | 144,920 | 305,362 | 450,282 | $0.5491 \%$ |
| Shakopee | 171,736 | 251,010 | 422,746 | $0.5155 \%$ |
| Shoreview | 359,697 | 107,278 | 466,975 | $0.5695 \%$ |
| ShOREWOOD | 86,563 | 173,229 | 259,792 | $0.3168 \%$ |
| South St. Paul | 295,473 | 229,977 | 525,450 | 0.6408\% |
| Spring Lake Park | 95,560 | 53,267 | 148,828 | $0.1815 \%$ |
| Stillwater | 203,088 | 146,520 | 349,607 | $0.4264 \%$ |
| Thief River Falls | 117,183 | 216,273 | 333,456 | 0.4067\% |
| Vadnais Heights | 161,525 | 56,039 | 217,564 | 0.2653\% |
| Virginia | 137,664 | 175,475 | 313,139 | $0.3819 \%$ |
| Waite Park | 73,440 | 17,206 | 90,646 | $0.1105 \%$ |
| Waseca | 122,669 | 42,376 | 165,045 | $0.2013 \%$ |
| West St. Paul | 281,590 | 153,561 | 435, 151 | $0.5307 \%$ |
| White Bear Lake | 361,409 | 285,227 | 646,635 | 0.7886\% |
| Witlmar | 256,471 | 304,388 | 560,859 | 0.6840\% |
| WINONA | 371,576 | 323,117 | 694,693 | $0.8472 \%$ |
| Woodbury | 293,688 | 495,216 | 788,905 | $0.9621 \%$ |
| WORTHINGTON | 145,959 | 125,513 | 271,472 | $0.3311 \%$ |
|  | \$41,000,000 | \$41,000, 000 | \$82,000,000 | 100.0000\% |


| Municipality | 1991 Total Allotment | Estimated 1992 Total Allotment | Increase (Decrease) Amount | \% <br> Increase Decrease |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albert Lea | \$572,460 | \$561,365 | (\$11, 095) | 1.94\% |
| Alexandria | 298,618 | 322,052 | 23,434 | 7.85\% |
| Andover | 558,779 | 646,324 | 87,545 | 15.67\% |
| Anoka | 398, 087 | 410, 304 | 12,217 | 3.07\% |
| Apple Valley | 851,016 | 933,776 | 82,760 | 9.72\% |
| Arden Hills | 189,278 | 204,876 | 15,598 | 8.24\% |
| Austin | 857,328 | 807,262 | $(50,066)$ | -5.84\% |
| Bemidji | 432,942 | 426,109 | $(6,833)$ | -1.58\% |
| Blaine | 919,973 | 928,950 | 8,977 | $0.98 \%$ |
| Bloomington | 2,967,545 | 3,042,527 | 74,982 | 2.53\% |
| Brainerd | 351, 065 | 359,201 | 8,136 | 2.32\% |
| Brooklyn Center | 861,771 | 832,143 | $(29,628)$ | -3.44\% |
| Brooklyn Park | 1,118,418 | 1,117,774 | (644) | -0.06\% |
| Buffalo | 226,243 | 240,392 | 14,149 | 6.25\% |
| Burnsville | 1,160,871 | 1,313,681 | 152,810 | 13.16\% |
| Cambridge |  | 100,752 |  | 0 |
| Champlin | 287,710 | 401,815 | 114,105 | 39.66\% |
| Chanhassen | 274,378 | 356,192 | 81,814 | 29.82\% |
| Chaska | 274,112 | 304,774 | 30,662 | 11.19\% |
| Chisholm | 222,774 | 199,426 | $(23,348)$ | -10.48\% |
| Cloquet | 505,408 | 509,200 | 3,792 | 0.75\% |
| Columbia Heights | 524,785 | 468, 311 | $(56,474)$ | -10.76\% |
| Coon Rapids | 1,101,408 | 1,272,906 | 171,498 | 15.57\% |
| Corcoran | 263,786 | 249,675 | $(14,111)$ | -5.35\% |
| Cottage Grove | 687,168 | 723,186 | 36,018 | 5.24\% |
| Crookston | 326,401 | 337,461 | 11,060 | 3.39\% |
| Crystal | 719,692 | 720,343 | 651 | 0.09\% |
| Detroit Lakes | 230,214 | 223,289 | $(6,925)$ | -3.01\% |
| Duluth | 3,372,351 | 3,177,834 | $(194,517)$ | -5.77\% |
| EAGAN | 972,579 | 1,258,039 | 285,460 | 29.35\% |
| East Bethel | 207,133 | 219,911 |  | 6.17\% |
| East Grand Forks | 239,521 | 232,398 | $(7,123)$ | -2.97\% |
| Eden Prairie | 1,066,880 | 1,292,736 | 225,856 | 21.17\% |
| Edina | 1,305,380 | 1,215,267 | $(90,113)$ | -6.90\% |
| Elk River | 374,501 | 432,769 | 58,268 | 15.56\% |
| Fairmont | 562,923 | 544,974 | $(17,949)$ | -3.19\% |


| Municipality | 1991 Total Allotment | Estimated 1992 TOTAL Allotment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { INCREASE } \\ & \text { (DECREASE) } \\ & \text { AMOUNT } \end{aligned}$ | \% <br> Increase Decrease |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Falcon Heights | \$96,704 | \$93,731 | $(\$ 2,973)$ | -3.07\% |
| Faribault | 551,801 | 582,335 | 30,534 | 5.53\% |
| Farmington | 269,871 | 305,914 | 36,043 | 13.36\% |
| Fergus Falls | 415, 056 | 427,329 | 12,273 | 2.969 |
| Forest Lake | 151,342 | 167,016 | 15,674 | 10.36\% |
| Fridley | 745,111 | 594,799 | $(150,312)$ | -20.17\% |
| Golden Valley | 805,673 | 765,137 | $(40,536)$ | -5.03\% |
| Grand Rapids | 303,047 | 285,156 | $(17,891)$ | -5.90\% |
| Ham Lake | 218,516 | 229,885 | 11,369 | 5.20\% |
| Hastings | 339,519 | 373,708 | 34,189 | 10.07\% |
| Hermantown | 152,664 | 290,769 | 138,105 | 90.46\% |
| Hibbing | 991,734 | 947,577 | $(44,157)$ | -4.45\% |
| Hopkins | 398,600 | 403,546 | 4,946 | 1.24\% |
| Hutchinson | 289,362 | 325,818 | 36,456 | 12.60\% |
| International Falls | 264,221 | 267,599 | 3,378 | 1.28\% |
| Inver Grove Heights | 509,839 | 607,134 | 97,295 | 19.08\% |
| Lake Elmo | 161,876 | 168,081 | 6,205 | 3.83\% |
| LAKEVILLE | 768,793 | 966,795 | 198,002 | 25.75\% |
| Lino Lakes | 311,891 | 334,788 | 22,897 | 7.34\% |
| Litchfield | 197,613 | 194,904 | $(2,709)$ | -1.37\% |
| Little Canada | 149,267 | 213,946 | 64,679 | 43.33\% |
| Little Falls | 336,063 | 315,767 | $(20,296)$ | -6.04\% |
| Mahtomedi | - 0 | 139,611 | 139,611 | 0.00\% |
| Mankato | 885,547 | 948,663 | 63,116 | 7.13\% |
| Maple Grove | 999,888 | 1,222,747 | 222,859 | 22.29\% |
| Maplewood | 683,563 | 654, 225 | $(29,338)$ | -4.29\% |
| Marshall | 285,200 | 267,670 | $(17,530)$ | -6.15\% |
| Mendota Heights | 230,186 | 258,786 | 28,600 | 12.42\% |
| Minneapolis | 10,858,854 | 10,480,359 | $(378,495)$ | -3.49\% |
| Minnetonka | 1,225,262 | 1,388,555 | 163,293 | $13.33{ }^{\text {\% }}$ |
| Montevideo | 184,683 | 163,490 | $(21,193)$ | -11.48\% |
| Moorhead | 846,243 | 841, 374 | $(4,869)$ | -0.58\% |
| Morris | 159,254 | 157,512 | $(1,742)$ | -1.09\% |
| Mound | 224,960 | 226,148 | 1,188 | 0.53\% |
| Mounds View | 251,234 | 190,310 | $(60,924)$ | -24.25\% |
| New Brighton | 522,166 | 494,985 | $(27,181)$ | -5.21\% |
| New Hope | 599,105 | 564,420 | $(34,685)$ | -5.79\% |
| New Ulm | 391,888 | 427,454 | 35,566 | 9.08\% |
| Northfield | 387,719 | 414,842 | 27,123 | 7.00\% |
| North Mankato | 268,893 | 257,236 | $(11,657)$ | -4.34\% |
| North St. Paul | 270,467 | 253,687 | $(16,780)$ | -6.20\% |
| Oakdale | 369,015 | 492,874 | 123,859 | 33.56 \% |


| Municipality | 1991 Total Allotment | Estimated 1992 TOTAL Allotment | Increase <br> (Decrease) Amount | $\%$ <br> Increase Decrease |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orono | \$266,648 | \$240,358 | $(\$ 26,290)$ | -9.86\% |
| Otsego | 357,193 | 332,610 | $(24,583)$ | -6.88\% |
| OWATONNA | 619:488 | 615,907 | $(3,581)$ | -0.58\% |
| Plymouth | 1,018,279 | 1,401,435 | 383,156 | 37.63\% |
| Prior Lake | 355, 215 | 358,897 | 3,682 | 1.04\% |
| Ramsey | 439,173 | 441,157 | 1,984 | 0.45\% |
| Red Wing | 645,676 | 651,752 | 6,076 | 0.94\% |
| Richfield | 969,183 | 1,031,750 | 62,567 | 6.46\% |
| Robbinsdale | 352,713 | 336,362 | $(16,351)$ | -4.64\% |
| Rochester | 1,876,595 | 2,085,101 | 208,506 | 11.11\% |
| Rosemount | 321,529 | 402, 253 | 80,724 | 25.11 \% |
| Roseville | 956,321 | 861,399 | $(94,922)$ | -9.93\% |
| St. Anthony | 147,667 | 140,029 | $(7,638)$ | -5.17最 |
| St. Cloud | 1,249,122 | 1,355,217 | 106,095 | 8.49\% |
| St. Louls Park | 899,082 | 1,043,377 | 144,295 | 16.05\% |
| St. Paul | 8,317,561 | 7,852,074 | $(465,487)$ | -5.60\% |
| St. Peter | 239,106 | 237, 464 | $(1,642)$ | -0.69\% |
| SARTELL | 0 | 139,167 | 139,167 | 0.00\% |
| Sauk Rapids | 210,370 | 237,767 | 27,397 | 13.02\% |
| Savage | 367,934 | 450, 282 | 82,348 | 22.38\% |
| Shakopee | 393,339 | 422,746 | 29,407 | 7.48 显 |
| Shoreview | 381,697 | 466,975 | 85,278 | 22.34\% |
| SHOREWOOD | 265,150 | 259,792 | $(5,358)$ | -2.02\% |
| South St. Paul | 575,653 | 525,450 | $(50,203)$ | -8.72\% |
| Spring Lake Park | 119,245 | 148,828 | 29,583 | 24.81\% |
| Stillwater | 366,625 | 349,607 | $(17,018)$ | -4.64\% |
| Thief River Falls | 359,186 | 333,456 | $(25,730)$ | -7.16\% |
| Vadnais Heights | 138,535 | 217,564 | 79,029 | 57.05 \% |
| Virginia | 339,002 | 313,139 | $(25,863)$ | -7.63\% |
| Waite Park | 0 | 90,646 | 90,646 | 0.00\% |
| Waseca | 174,351 | 165,045 | $(9,306)$ | -5.34\% |
| West St. Paul | 434,387 | 435,151 | 764 | 0.18 \% |
| White Bear Lake | 593,117 | 646,635 | 53,518 | 9.02\% |
| Wi llmar | 544,888 | 560,859 | 15,971 | $2.93 \%$ |
| WInONA | 669,640 | 694,693 | 25,053 | 3.74\% |
| W00dBury | 821, 852 | 788,905 | $(32,947)$ | -4.01\% |
| WORTHINGTON | 317,749 | 271,472 | $(46,277)$ | -14.56\% |
| TOTAL | \$79,459,459 | \$82,000,000 | \$2,540,541 | 3.20\% |

The June Screening Board reduced the allowable amount from the present 2 times the construction allotment to 1.125 or $\$ 500,000$ (whichever is greater) effective September 1,1994. 74 cities are affected by the $\$ 500,000$ limitation.

|  | (A) |  | (B) | (C) <br> Amount | $\begin{gathered} \text { (D) } \\ 1.925 \end{gathered}$ | (E) |  | ( $A-E)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Municipality | $\begin{gathered} \text { Balance } \\ \text { As of } \\ 09-01-91 \end{gathered}$ | (-) | $1991$ <br> Construction (=) Al lotment | Available Without Last Const. Allot. | Times (A) Construction Allotment | 1994 <br> Allowable Amount |  | Excess <br> Balance |
| Albert Lea | \$1,189,539 |  | \$546,195 | \$643,344 | \$614,469 | \$614,469 |  | \$575,070 |
| Alexandria | 404,063 |  | 281,413 | 122,650 | 316,590 | 500,000 |  | $(95,937)$ |
| Andover | 317,109 |  | 419,084 | (101,975) | 471,470 | 500,000 |  | $(182,891)$ |
| Anoka | 464,906 |  | 341,799 | 123,107 | 384,524 | 500,000 |  | $(35,094)$ |
| Apple Valley | 741,564 |  | 822,681 | $(81,117)$ | 925,516 | 925,516 |  | $(183,952)$ |
| Arden Hills | .. |  | 184,508 | $(184,508)$ | 207,572 | 500,000 |  | $(500,000)$ |
| Austin | 1,549,014 |  | 823,818 | 725,196 | 926,795 | 926,795 |  | 622,219 |
| Bemidji | 1,038,068 |  | 411,327 | 626,741 | 462,743 | 500,000 |  | 538,068 |
| Blaine | 1,535,212 |  | 855,880 | 679,332 | 962,865 | 962,865 |  | 572,347 |
| Bloomington | 4,172,452 |  | 2,225,659 | 1,946,793 | 2,503,866 | 2,503,866 |  | 1,668,586 |
| Brainerd | 784,768 |  | 274,137 | 510,631 | 308,404 | 500,000 |  | 284,768 |
| Brooklyn Center | 780,493 |  | 829,821 | $(49,328)$ | 933,549 | 933,549 |  | $(153,056)$ |
| Brooklyn Park | 3,453,875 |  | 1,078,848 | 2,375,027 | 1,213,704 | 1,213,704 |  | 2,240,171 |
| Buffalo | 295,672 |  | 217,738 | 77,934 | 244,955 | 500,000 |  | $(204,328)$ |
| Burnsville | 624,305 |  | 870,653 | $(246,348)$ | 979,485 | 979,485 |  | $(355,180)$ |
| Champlin | 113,016 |  | 270,805 | (157,789) | 304,656 | 500,000 |  | $(386,984)$ |
| Chanhassen | 425,582 |  | 260,563 | 165,019 | 293,133 | 500,000 |  | $(74,418)$ |
| Chaska | 503,186 |  | 261,227 | 241,959 | 293,880 | 500,000 |  | 3,186 |
| Chisholm | 49,308 |  | 212,379 | (163,071) | 238,926 | 500,000 |  | $(450,692)$ |
| cloquet | 974,904 |  | 379,056 | 595,848 | 426,438 | 500,000 |  | 474,904 |
| Columbia Heights | 927,893 |  | 393,589 | 534,304 | 442,788 | 500,000 |  | 427,893 |
| Coon Rapids | 1,517,073 |  | 927,385 | 589,688 | 1,043,308 | 1,043,308 |  | 473,765 |
| Corcoran | 181,563 |  | 197,839 | $(16,276)$ | 222,569 | 500,000 |  | $(318,437)$ |
| Cottage Grove | 674,098 |  | 652,488 | 21,610 | 734,049 | 734,049 |  | $(59,951)$ |
| Crookston | -- |  | 312,541 | $(312,541)$ | 351,609 | 500,000 |  | $(500,000)$ |
| Crystal | 1,470,740 |  | 539,769 | 930,971 | 607,240 | 607,240 |  | 863,500 |
| Detroit Lakes | 1,811 |  | 216,699 | $(214,888)$ | 243,786 | 500,000 |  | $(498,189)$ |
| Duluth | 1,434,115 |  | 2,529,263 | $(1,095,148)$ | 2,845,421 | 2,845,421 |  | $(1,411,306)$ |
| Eagan | 742,833 |  | 917,604 | (174,771) | 1,032,305 | 1,032,305 |  | $(289,472)$ |
| East Bethel | 68,512 |  | 178,618 | $(110,106)$ | 200,945 | 500,000 |  | $(431,488)$ |
| East Grand Forks | 100,551 |  | 223,666 | (123,115) | 251,624 | 500,000 |  | $(399,449)$ |
| Eden Prairie | 214,128 |  | 1,019,870 | $(805,742)$ | 1,147,354 | 1,147,354 |  | $(933,226)$ |
| Edina | 2,911,521 |  | 1,125,380 | 1,786,141 | 1,266,053 | 1,266,053 |  | 1,645,469 |
| Elk River | 78,458 |  | 346,706 | $(268,248)$ | 390,044 | 500,000 |  | $(421,542)$ |
| Fairmont | 247,384 |  | 537,198 | $(289,814)$ | 604,348 | 604,348 |  | $(356,964)$ |
| Falcon Heights | -- |  | 92,894 | $(92,894)$ | 104,506 | 500,000 |  | $(500,000)$ |




[^1]THAT: Be it resolved that an amount of $\$ 199,434$ (not to exceed $1 / 4$ of 1\% of the 1991 M.S.A.S. Apportionment sum of $\$ 79,773,732$ shall be set aside from the 1991 Apportionment fund and be credited to the research account.

MOTION BY:
SECONDED BY:

|  | ```Past History of the Research Account``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Allotment | Balance | Spent |
| 1958 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| 1959 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1960 | 20,271 | 10,911 | 9,360 |
| 1961 | 20,926 | 18,468 | 2,458 |
| 1962 | 22,965 | 21,661 | 1,304 |
| 1963 | 22,594 | 18,535 | 4,059 |
| 1964 | 23,627 | 24,513 | 0 |
| 1965 | 27,418 | 15,763 | 11,655 |
| 1966 | 28,426 | 17,782 | 10,644 |
| 1967 | 29,155 | 31,944 | 0 |
| 1968 | 31,057 | 28,433 | 2,624 |
| 1969 | 35,719 | 34,241 | 1,478 |
| 1970 | 37,803 | 35,652 | 2,151 |
| 1971 | 41,225 | 37,914 | 3,311 |
| 1972 | 45,227 | 44,468 | 759 |
| 1973 | 45,846 | 36,861 | 8,985 |
| 1974 | 46,622 | 19.268 | 27,354 |
| 1975 | 54,321 | 35,755 | 18,566 |
| 1976 | 57,103 | 33,901 | 23,202 |
| 1977 | 56,983 | 33,674 | 23,309 |
| 1978 | 68,990 | 70,787 | 0 |
| 1979 | 69,665 | 0 | 69,665 |
| 1980 | 77,116 | 36,352 | 40,764 |
| 1981 | 85,031 | 33,940 | 51,091 |
| 1982 | 88,920 | 47,990 | 40,930 |
| 1983 | 105,082 | 37,656 | 67,426 |
| 1984 | 115,766 | 57,879 | 57,887 |
| 1985 | 121,838 | 73,118 | 48,720 |
| 1986 | 142,188 | 98,607 | 43,581 |
| 1987 | 147,745 | 82,479 | 65,266 |
| 1988 | 132,754 | 72,201 | 60,553 |
| 1989 | 145,953 | 42,379 | 103,574 |
| 1990 | 191,254 | 40,960 | 150,294 |
| 1991 | 203,793 |  |  |

The unexpended balances in the research account at the end of each year is transferred back to the state aid fund from which they were obtained.

## Past History

of
Administration Account
$1 \mathbf{1 / 2} \%$ of the total funds available are set aside for the administration of State Aid. The account is used for expenses of Screening Board meetings, Variances meetings, printing of state Aid material etc..

| Year | Allotment | Balance | Spent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1958 | \$113,220 | \$48,310 | \$64,910 |
| 1959 | 125,999 | 55,370 | 70,629 |
| 1960 | 129,466 | 58,933 | 70,533 |
| 1961 | 140,825 | 75,036 | 65,789 |
| 1962 | 137,980 | 70,875 | 67,105 |
| 1963 | 144,585 | 75,094 | 69,491 |
| 1964 | 168,526 | 102,385 | 66,141 |
| 1965 | 173,875 | 96,136 | 77,739 |
| 1966 | 178,253 | 85,079 | 93,174 |
| 1967 | 190,524 | 122,185 | 68,339 |
| 1968 | 219,458 | 117,878 | 101,580 |
| 1969 | 231,452 | 134,416 | 97,036 |
| 1970 | 252,736 | 147,968 | 104,768 |
| 1971 | 279,357 | 165,927 | 113,430 |
| 1972 | 280,143 | 167,410 | 112,733 |
| 1973 | 284,923 | 160,533 | 124,390 |
| 1974 | 333,944 | 130,460 | 203,484 |
| 1975 | 349,512 | 158,851 | 190,661 |
| 1976 | 347,940 | 264,874 | 83,066 |
| 1977 | 424,767 | 160,365 | 264,402 |
| 1978 | 426,786 | 139,580 | 287,206 |
| 1979 | 473,075 | 257,782 | 215,293 |
| 1980 | 521,544 | 171,544 | 350,000 |
| 1981 | 544,123 | 222,062 | 322,061 |
| 1982 | 646,373 | 251,781 | 394,592 |
| 1983 | 710,025 | 297,847 | 412,178 |
| 1984 | 745,773 | 322,730 | 423,043 |
| 1985 | 874,173 | 421,719 | 452,454 |
| 1986 | 903,824 | 427,562 | 476,262 |
| 1987 | 806,340 | 331,589 | 474,751 |
| 1988 | 895,092 | 387,171 | 507,921 |
| 1989 | 1,111,120 | 582,918 | 528,202 |
| 1990 | 1,248,109 | 218,586 | 1,029,523 |
| 1991 | 1,216,604 |  |  |

The unexpended balance of the administration account at the end of the year is transferred back to the state aid fund from which it was obtained.

# CURRENT RESOLUTIONS <br> OF THE <br> MUNICIPAL SCREENING BOARD 

JUNE 1991
BE IT RESOLVED:

## ADMINISTRATION

Appointments to Screening Board - Oct. 1961 (Revised June 1981)
That annually the Commissioner of $\mathrm{Mn} / \mathrm{DOT}$ will be requested to appoint three (3) new members, upon recommendation of the City Engineers Association of Minnesota, to serve three (3) year terms as voting members of the Municipal Screening Board. These appointees are selected from the Nine Construction Districts together with one representative from each of the three (3) major cities of the first class.

## Screening Board Chairman and Vice Chairman - June 1987

That the Chairman and Vice Chairman, nominated annually at the annual meeting of the City Engineers association of Minnesota and subsequently appointed by the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Transportation shall not have a vote in matters before the Screening Board unless they are also the duly appointed Screening Board Representative of a construction District or of a City of the first class.

Screening Board Secretary - Oct. 1961
That annually, the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Transportation (Mn/DOT) may be requested to appoint a secretary, upon recommendation of the City Engineers' Association of Minnesota, as a non-voting member of the Municipal Screening Board for the purpose of recording all Screening Board actions.

Appointment to the Needs Study Subcommittee - June 1987
The Screening Board Chairman shall annually appoint one city engineer, who has served on the Screening Board, to serve a three year term on the Needs Study Subcommittee. The appointment shall be made after the annual Spring meeting of the Municipal Screening Board. The appointed subcommittee person shall serve as chairman of the subcommittee in the third year of the appointment.

## Appointment to Unencumbered Construction Funds Subcommittee - Revised June 1979

The Screening Board past Chairman be appointed to serve a three-year term on the Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee. This will continue to maintain an experienced group to follow a program of accomplishments.

The alternate to a third year member be invited to attend the final meeting. A formal request to the alternates governing body would request that he attend the meetings and the municipality pay for its expenses.

## Appearance Screening Board - Oct. 1962 (Revised Oct. 1982)

That any individual or delegation having items of concern regarding the study of State Aid Needs or State Aid Apportionment amounts, and wishing to have consideration given to these items, shall, in a written report, communicate with the State Aid Engineer. The State Aid Engineer with concurrence of the Chairman of the Screening Board shall determine which requests are to be referred to the Screening Board for their consideration. This resolution does not abrogate the right of the Screening Board to call any person or persons before the Board for discussion purposes.

## Research Account - Oct. 1961

That an annual resolution be considered for setting aside a reasonable amount of money for the Research Account to continue municipal street research activity.

Soil Type - Oct. 1961

That the soil type classification as approved by the 1961 Municipal Screening Board, for all municipalities under Municipal State Aid be adopted for the 1962 Needs Study and 1963 apportionment on all streets in the respective municipalities. Said classifications are to be continued in use until subsequently amended or revised by Municipal Screening Board action.

## Improper Needs Report - Oct. 1961

That the Office of State Aid and the District State Aid Engineer is requested to recommend an adjustment of the Needs Reporting whenever there is a reason to believe that said reports have deviated from accepted standards and to submit their recommendations to the Screening Board, with a copy to the municipality involved, or its engineer.

New Cities Needs - Oct. 1983
Any new city which has determined their eligible mileage, but does not have an approved State Aid System, their money needs will be determined at the cost per mile of the lowest other city.

That for the purpose of measuring the Needs of the Municipal State Aid Highway System, the annual cut off date for recording construction accomplishments based upon the project award date shall be December 31st of the preceding year.

## Construction Accomplishments - (Oct. 1988)

When a Municipal State Aid Street is constructed to State Aid Standards, said street shall be considered adequate for a period of 20 years from the date of project letting or encumbrance of force account funds.

If, during the period that complete needs are being received the street is improved with a bituminous overlay or concrete joint repair the municipality will continue to receive complete needs but shall have the non-local cost of the bituminous resurfacing or concrete joint repair construction project deducted from its total needs for a period of ten (10) years.

If the construction of the Municipal State Aid Street is accomplished with local funds, only the construction needs necessary to bring the roadway up to State Aid Standards will be permitted in subsequent needs for 20 years from the date of the letting or encumbrance of force account funds. At the end of the 20 year period, reinstatement for complete construction needs shall be initiated by the Municipality.

Needs for resurfacing, lighting, and traffic signals shall be allowed on all Municipal State Aid Streets at all times.

That any bridge construction project shall cause the needs of the affected bridge to be removed for a period of 35 years from the project letting date or date of force account agreement. At the end of the 35 year period, needs for complete reconstruction of the bridge will be reinstated in the needs study at the initiative of the Municipal Engineer. If, during the period that complete bridge needs are being received the bridge is improved with a bituminous overlay, the municipality will continue to receive complete needs but shall have the non-local cost of the overlay deducted from its total needs for a period of ten (10) years.

The adjustments above will apply regardless of the source of funding for the road or bridge project. Needs may be granted as an exception to this resolution upon request by the Municipal Engineer and justification to the satisfaction of the State Aid Engineer (e.g., a deficiency due to changing standards, projected traffic, or other verifiable causes).

In the event that.a M.S.A.S route earning "After the Fact" needs is removed from the M.S.A. system, then, the "After the Fact" needs shall be removed from the needs study, except if transferred to another state system. No adjustment will be required on needs earned prior to the revocation.

## DESIGN

Design Limitation on Non-Existing Streets - Oct. 1965
That non-existing streets shall not have their needs computed on the basis of urban design unless justified to the satisfaction of the Commissioner.

Less Than Minimum Width - Oct. 1961 (Revised 1986)

That in the event that a Municipal State Aid Street is constructed with State Aid Funds to a width less than the standard design width as reported in the Needs Study, the total needs shall be taken off such constructed street other than the surface replacement need. Surface replacement and other future needs shall be limited to the constructed width unless exception is justified to the satisfaction of the Commissioner.

## Greater Than Minimum Width

If a Municipal State Aid Street is constructed to a width wider than required, only the width required by rules will be allowed for future resurfacing needs.

Miscellaneous Limitations - Oct. 1961
That miscellaneous items such as fence removal, bituminous surface removal, manhole adjustment, and relocation of street lights are not permitted in the Municipal State Aid Street Needs Study. The item of retaining walls, however, shall be included in the Needs Study.

## MILEAGE

(Feb. 1959)
The maximum mileage for Municipal State Aid Street designation shall be 20 percent of the municipality's basic mileage - which is comprised of the total improved streets less Trunk Highway and County State Aid Highways.
(Nov. 1965-Revised 1972)

The maximum mileage for Municipal State Aid Street designation shall be based on the Annual Certification of Mileage current as of December 31st of the preceding year. Submittal of a supplementary certification during the year shall not be permitted.

However, the maximum mileage for State Aid designation may be exceeded to the extent necessary to designate trunk highway turnbacks, only if sufficient mileage is not available as determined by the Annual Certification of Mileage.
(Jan. 1969)
Any mileage for designation prior to the trunk highway turnback shall be used for the turnback before exceeding the maximum mileage.

In the event the maximum mileage is exceeded by a trunk highway turnback, no additional designation other than trunk highway turnbacks can be considered until allowed by the computations of the Annual Certification of Mileage within which the maximum mileage for State Aid designation is determined.

Oct. 1961 (Revised May 1980, Oct. 1982 and Oct. 1983)
All requests for additional mileage or revisions to the Municipal State Aid System must be received by the District State Aid Engineer by March first. The District State Aid Engineer will forward the request to the State Aid Engineer for review. A City Council resolution of approved mileage and the Needs Study reporting data must be received by the State Aid Engineer by May first, to be included in the current year's Needs Study. Any requests for additional mileage or revisions to the Municipal State Aid Systems received by the District State Aid Engineer after March first will be included in the following year's Needs Study.

One Way Street Mileage - June 1983 (Revised Oct. 1984)
That any one-way streets added to the Municipal State Aid Street system must be reviewed by the Needs Study Sub-Committee, and approved by the Screening Board before any one-way street can be treated as one-half mileage in the Needs Study.

A one-way street will be treated as one-half of a full four-lane width divided street of either 56 feet or 72 feet ( 72 feet when the projected ADT is over 8,000 ) for needs, and that the roadway system must be operating as one-way streets prior to the time of designation.

MSA

| ROUTE <br> NO. |  | TERMINI |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 134 | EB Fifth St. | - Fort Rd. (W. 7th St.) |
| 198 | WB Sixth St. | to Broadway St. |
| 235 | NB Wabasha St. | - Kellogg Blvd. |
| 236 | SB St. Peter St. | to Twelfth St. |
| 165 | NB Minnesota St. | - Kellogg Blvd. |
| 117 | SB Cedar St. | to Tenth St. |
| 196 | NB Sibley St. | - Shepard Road |
|  | SB Jackson St. | to Seventh St. |

APPROVAL
DATE MILEAGE
6/89 0.85 Miles $\quad 28^{\prime} \& 36^{\prime}$
0.86 Miles $36^{\prime}$

6/89 0.61 Miles 36' 0.62 Miles $36^{\prime}$

6/89 0.47 Miles 36' 0.46 Miles 36'

6/89 0.34 Miles
36'
CSAH
4.21 Miles

## COST

Construction Item Unit Prices - (Revised Annually)
Right of Way (Needs only) \$ 60,000.00 Acre
Grading (Excavation)
\$ $\quad 3.00 \mathrm{Cu} . \mathrm{Yd}$.
Base:

| Class 4 | Spec. \#2211 | \$ | 4.75 Ton |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Class 5 | Spec. \#2211 |  | 6.00 Ton |
| Bituminous | Spec. \#2331 |  | 20.00 Ton |

Surface:

Bituminous
Bituminous
Bituminous

Shoulders:
Gravel
Spec. \#2221
Spec. \#2331
Spec. \#2341
Spec. \#2361
\$ 7.00 Ton

Miscellaneous:
Storm Sewer Construction
Storm Sewer Adjustment
Special Drainage-Rural
Traffic Signals
\$196,000.00 Mile 62,000.00 Mile 25,000.00 Mile 18,750 to $75,000.00$ Mile

Signal Needs Based On Projected Traffic

| Projected Traffic | Percentage X | Unit Price $=$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0-4,999$ | .25 | $\$ 75,000=$ |
| $5,000-9,999$ | .50 | $75,000=$ |
| $10,000 \&$ Over | 1.00 | $75,000=$ |

Needs Per Mile
\$ 18,750.00 Mile
37,500.00 Mile
75,000.00 Mile

| Street Lighting | $16,000.00 \mathrm{Mile}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Curb \& Gutter | 5.50 Lin. Ft. |
| Sidewalk | 14.00 Sq. Yd. |
| Engineering | $18 \%$ |

## Removal Items:

Curb \& Gutter
Sidewalk
Concrete Pavement
Tree Removal
\$ 1.60 Lin. Ft.
4.00 Sq. Yd.
4.00 Sq. Yd. 140.00 Unit

## STRUCTURES

Bridge Costs - Oct. 1961 (Revised Annually)
That for the study of needs on the Municipal State Aid Street System, bridge costs shall be computed as follows:

| Bridges 0 to 149 Ft | $\$ 55.00 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. |
| :--- | ---: |
| Bridges 150 to 499 Ft. | $60.00 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. |
| Bridges $500 \&$ Over | $65.00 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. |
| Bridge Widening | $150.00 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. |

"The money needs for all "non-existing" bridges and grade separations be removed from the Needs Study until such time that a construction project is awarded. At that time a money needs adjustment shall be made by annually adding the total amount of the structure cost that is eligible for State Aid reimbursement for a 15 -year period." This directive to exclude all Federal or State grants.

Bridge Width \& Costs - (Revised Annually)
That after conferring with the Bridge Section of Mn/DOT and using the criteria as set forth by this Department as to the standard design for railroad structures, that the following costs based on number of tracks be used for the Needs Study:

## Railroad Over Highway

Number of Tracks - 1
Each Additional Track
\$4,000 Lin. Ft.
\$3,000 Lin. Ft.

## RAILROAD CROSSINGS

Railroad Crossing Costs - (Revised Annually)
That for the study of needs on the Municipal State Aid Street System, the following costs shall be used in computing the needs of the proposed Railroad Protection Devices:

## Railroad Grade Crossings

| Signals - (Single track - low speed) | $\$ 80,000$ Unit |
| :--- | :--- |
| Signals and Gates(Multiple Track - high | $\$ 110,000$ Unit |
| Signs Only \& low speed) | $\$ 5500$ Unit |
| Rubberized Railroad Crossings (Per Track) | $\$ 8850 \mathrm{Lin} . \mathrm{Ft}$. |

## Maintenance Needs Costs - June 1990

That for the study of needs on the Municipal State Aid Street System, the following costs shall be used in determining the maintenance apportionment needs cost for existing facilities only.

|  | Cost For <br> Under 1000 <br> Vehicles Per Day | Cost For <br> Over 1000 <br> Vehicles Per Day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic Lanes: <br> Segment length times number of traffic lanes times cost per mile. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,200 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2,000 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Parking Lanes: <br> Segment length times number of parking lanes times cost per mile. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,200 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 1,200 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Median Strip: <br> Segment length times cost per mile. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 400 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 800 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Storm Sewer: <br> Segment length times cost per mile. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 400 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 400 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Traffic Signals: <br> Number of traffic signals times cost for each signal. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 400 \\ & \text { (Per Each) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 400 \\ & \text { (Per Each) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Unlimited Segments: Normal M.S.A.S. Street |  |  |
| Minimum allowance for mile is determined by segment length times cost per mile. | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 4,000 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 4,000 \\ & \text { (Per Mile) } \end{aligned}$ |

\$2,000
(Per Mile)
\$2,000
(Per Mile)

## NEEDS ADJUSTMENTS

Expenditures Off State Aid System - Oct. 1961
That any authorized Municipal State Aid expenditure on County State Aid or State Trunk Highway projects shall be compensated for by annually deducting the full amount thereof from the Money Needs for a period of ten years.

Bond Adjustment - Oct. 1961 (Revised 1976, 1979)
That a separate annual adjustment shall be made in total money Needs of a municipality that has sold and issued bonds pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 162.18, for use on State Aid projects.

That this adjustment, which covers the amortization period, and which annually reflects the net unamortized bonded debt shall be accomplished by adding said net unamortized amount to the computed money needs of the municipality.

For the purpose of this adjustment, the net unamortized bonded debt shall be the total unamortized bonded indebtedness less the unexpended bond amount as of December 31st of the preceding year.

That for the purpose of this separate annual adjustment, the unamortized balance of the St. Paul Bond Account, as authorized in 1953, 2nd United Improvement Program, and as authorized in 1946, Capital Approach Improvement Bonds, shall be considered in the same manner as those bonds sold and issued pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 162.18.
"Bond account money spent off State Aid System would not be eligible for Bond Account Adjustment. This action would not be retroactive, but would be in effect for the remaining term of the Bond issue."

Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance Adjustment - Oct. 1961
(Revised June 1986)
That for the determination of Apportionment Needs, the amount of the unencumbered construction fund balance as of September 1st of the current year, not including the current year construction apportionment, shall be deducted from the 25 -year total Needs of each individual municipality.

Projects that have been received before September 1st by the District State Aid Engineer for payment shall be considered as being encumbered and the construction balances shall be so adjusted.

Whenever a municipality's construction fund balance available as of February 1, of the current year, not including the current years allotment, exceeds $\$ 500,000$ or two times their annual construction allotment (whichever is greater) shall be considered an excess balance. The State Aid Office shall notify the City in writing by March 1st of this excess balance and outline the financial impact to the City if this unencumbered construction fund balance is not reduced to the stated amount by September 1, of that year. The State Aid Office shall review the balance as of June 30, and send a second notice to those cities still exceeding the allowable unencumbered construction fund balance based upon the criteria stated above and include further explanation of the financial impact to their city if the balance is not reduced within the guidelines by September 1, of that same year. When a city had received an adjustment in a previous year due to an excess balance, in the following years the allowable balance shall be computed without that adjustment. The loss in apportionment for that adjustment shall be computed by using the rate that its money needs bears to the total money needs of all other cities. The Unencumbered Construction Fund Subcommittee shall meet with those cities still having an excess unencumbered construction fund balance after September 1, review with them the proposed adjustment to their 25 year construction needs and make recommendations to the Screening Board. It is understood that either the submittal of a report of State Aid Contract or report of final contract approved by the District State Aid Engineer by September 1, which reduces the fund balance within required limits shall be considered acceptable to meeting the intent of this particular resolution. In the event the city does not meet the requirements of this resolution to reduce their unencumbered construction fund balance as per the criteria stated above, an adjustment of twice the amount available (city's unencumbered construction fund balance less the current years construction allotment) will be deducted from the city's twenty-five year needs prior to the succeeding year apportionment. The initial adjustment, based on the last allocation, loss of apportionment shall not exceed the excess balance. Unless the balance is reduced to the limits specified above in future years, this deduction will be increased annually to $3,4,5$, etc. times the amount until such time the money needs are reduced to zero. This adjustment would be in addition to the unencumbered construction fund balance adjustment previously defined.

## (Revised Oct. 1981)

By January 1, 1983, each municipality shall submit a revised 5-year construction program which has been approved by their city council. This program shall include sufficient projects to utilize all existing and anticipated funds accruing during the life of the program. The program will be updated at 3 -year intervals and a review made at that time to ascertain program implementation.

Right of Way - Oct. 1965 (Revised June 1986)
The Right of Way needs shall be included in the apportionment needs based on the unit price per mile, until such time that the right of way is acquired and the actual cost established. At that time a money needs adjustment shall be made by annually adding the local cost (which is the total cost less county or trunk highway participation) for a 15 -year period. Only right of way acquisition costs that are eligible for State-Aid reimbursement shall be included in the right-of-way money needs adjustment. This Directive to exclude all Federal or State grants. Right-of-way projects that are funded with State Aid Funds will be compiled by the State Aid

Office. When "After the Fact" needs are requested for right-of-way projects that have been funded with local funds, but qualify for State Aid reimbursement, documentation (copies of warrants and description of acquisition) must be submitted to the State Aid Office.

## Variance Granted - Reduction of Money Needs - Oct. 1982 (Revised Oct. 1984) (Revised Oct. 1987) (Revised Oct. 1989)

That the State Aid Office give future money needs based on the date of variance approval.
The adjustment for width variances will be based on the needs cost of the base and surface, times the proportional difference between the minimum standards and the granted variance, times fifteen or the proportional difference between average past 15 years of base and surface needs received and the granted variance times fifteen (Documentation shall be furnished by the City to the State Aid Office at the same time as the "Hold Harmless" City Council resolution is submitted for final variance approval.) This would be a one-year adjustment to the 25 -year needs.

Trunk Highway Turnback - Oct. 1967 (Revised June 1989)
That any trunk highway turnback which reverts directly to the municipality and becomes part of the State Aid Street system shall not have its construction needs considered in the money needs apportionment determination as long as the former trunk highway is fully eligible for 100 percent construction payment from the Municipal Turnback Account. During this time of eligibility, financial aid for the additional maintenance obligation, of the municipality imposed by the turnback shall be computed on the basis of the current year's apportionment data and shall be accomplished in the following manner.

Initial Turnback Maintenance Adjustment - Fractional Year Reimbursement:
The initial turnback adjustment when for less than 12 full months shall provide partial maintenance cost reimbursement by adding said initial adjustment to the money needs which will produce approximately $1 / 12$ of $\$ 7,200$ per mile in apportionment funds for each month or part of a month that the municipality had maintenance responsibility during the initial year.

To provide an advance payment for the coming year's additional maintenance obligation, a needs adjustment per mile shall be added to the annual money needs. This needs adjustment per mile shall produce sufficient apportionment funds so that at least $\$ 7,200$ in apportionment shall be earned for each mile of trunk highway turnback on Municipal State Aid Street System.

Turnback adjustments shall terminate at the end of the calendar year during which a construction contract has been awarded that fulfills the Municipal Turnback Account Payment provisions; and the resurfacing needs for the awarded project shall be included in the Needs Study for the next apportionment.

## Traffic Limitation on Non-Existing Streets - Oct. 1965

That non-existing street shall not have their needs computed on a traffic count of more than 4,999 vehicles per day unless justified to the satisfaction of the Commissioner.

Traffic Manual - Oct. 1962
That for the 1965 and all future Municipal State Aid Street Needs Studies, the Needs Study procedure shall utilize traffic data developed according to the Traffic Estimating Manual M.S.A.S. \#5-892.700. This manual shall be prepared and kept current under the direction of the Screening Board regarding methods of counting traffic and computing average daily traffic. The manner and scope of reporting is detailed in the above mentioned manual.

## Traffic Counting - Sept. 1973 (Revised June 1987)

That future traffic data for State Aid Needs Studies be developed as follows:

1. The municipalities in the metropolitan area cooperate with the State by agreeing to participate in counting traffic every two years.
2. The cities in the outstate area may have their traffic counted for a nominal fee and maps prepared by State forces every four years, or may elect to continue the present procedure of taking their own counts and preparing their own traffic maps at four year intervals.
3. Some deviations from the present four-year counting cycle shall be permitted during the interim period of conversion to counting by State forces in the outstate area.

[^0]:    $\begin{aligned} & \text { Money Needs } \\ & \text { Apporticoment }\end{aligned}=\frac{\$ 40,907,634}{\$ 1,291,459,722} \quad$ equals $0.0315755012 \quad \times \quad$ Adj. $25 \gamma_{r}$. const. Heeds

[^1]:    * The allowable balance in (E) is 1.125 times the construction allotment or $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ (whichever is greater.)

