

1991 MUNICIPAL STATE AID NEEDS REPORT

October 1991

MNDOT HE 356 .M6 M53b 1991



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,

rue!

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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1991 MUNICIPAL SCREENING BOARD	1
SUBCOMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE SCREENING BOARD	2
Past Municipal Screening Board Representatives	3-4
MAP OF HIGHWAY DISTRICTS AND URBAN MUNICIPALITIES	5
MINUTES OF THE SPRING SCREENING BOARD MEETING	6-29
MILEAGE, NEEDS AND APPORTIONMENT HISTORY	30-31
Improved Mileage Record	32-33
Maximum Mileage Record	34-36
THEORETICAL 1991 POPULATION APPORTIONMENT	37-40
Needs Study Update	41-45
ITEMIZED TABULATION OF NEEDS	46-47
1990 To 1991 Money Needs Comparison	48
MONEY NEEDS RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSIONER	49
Money Needs Recommendation	50-51
TENTATIVE MONEY NEEDS APPORTIONMENT DETERMINATION	52-53
Excess Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance	54
UNENCUMBERED CONSTRUCTION FUND BALANCE	55-57
Expenditures Off the M.S.A.S. System	58-61
UNAMORTIZED BOND ACCOUNT BALANCE	62-63
Non-Existent Bridge Construction	64
RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION	65-67
BITUMINOUS OVERLAY AND CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR	68-69
VARIANCES	70-77
TRUNK HIGHWAY TURNBACK ALLOWANCE	78-79
TOTAL THEORETICAL 1992 TOTAL APPORTIONMENT	80-82
1991 TO 1992 TOTAL THEORETICAL APPORTIONMENT COMPARISON	83-85
PROPOSED 1994 ALLOWABLE EXCESS UNENCUMBERED BALANCE	86-88
Research Account Motion	89
Administration Account	90
SCREENING COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS	91-102

1991 MUNICIPAL SCREENING BOARD

OFFICERS

			•
CHAIRMAN	JIM GRUBE	<u>S</u> t. Lou <u>i</u> s Park	(612) 924-2551
VICE CHAIRMAN	DAN EDWARDS	FERGUS FALLS	(218) 739-2251
Secretary	Alan Gray	EDEN PRAIRIE	(612) 937-2262

MEMBERS

DISTRIC	t Served	Representative			
1	1	Jim Prusak	CLOQUET	(218)	879-6758
2	1	David Kildahl	CROOKSTON	(218)	281-6522
3	1	SIDNEY WILLIAMSON	Sauk Rapids	(612)	251-4553
4	3	Alvin Moen	ALEXANDRIA	(612)	762-8149
5	2	MICHAEL EASTLING	RICHFIELD	(612)	861-9700
6	3	Tom Drake	RED WING	(612)	227-6220
7	2	PETE MCCLURG	New Ulm	(507)	359-8245
8	1	DALE SWANSON	WILLMAR	(612)	235-4202
9	2	Ken Haider	MAPLEWOOD	(612)	770-4552
(THREE	CITIES	Kenneth Larson	DULUTH	(218)	723-3278
OF TH	E	Marvin Hoshaw	MINNEAPOLIS	(612)	673-2476
FIRST	Class)	THOMAS KUHFELD	ST. PAUL	(612)	292-6276
DISTRIC	т	ALTERNATES			
1	-	BILL BENNETT	Hermantown	(218)	727-8456
2		DON BOELL	Bemidji	(218)	751-5610
3		Curt Kreklau	BUFFALO	(612)	253-1000
4		Herb Reimer	MOORHEAD	(218)	299-5390
5		LARRY ANDERSON	Prior Lake	(612)	447-4230
6		Arnold Putnam	Owatonna	(507)	451-4541
7		Ken Saffert	Mankato	(507)	625-3161
8		RICH VICTOR	MARSHALL	(507)	537-6774
9		Brian Bachmeier	Oakdale	(612)	739-5086

1991 SUBCOMMITTEES

NEEDS STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE

CLYDE BUSBY - CHAIRMAN HIBBING (218) 262-3486 EXPIRES IN 1991

CHARLES SIGGERUD BURNSVILLE (612) 895-4400 EXPIRES IN 1992

FRED MOORE - CHAIRMAN PLYMOUTH (612) 550-5000 EXPIRES IN 1991

UNENCUMBERED CONSTRUCTION FUNDS SUBCOMMITTEE

RON RUDRUD BLOOMINGTON (612) 881-5811 EXPIRES IN 1992

BRUCE BULLERT SAVAGE (612) 890-1045 EXPIRES IN 1993

JOE BETTENDORF LITCHFIELD (612) 252-4740 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 Brainerd	RONNING Fergus Falls	LANGSETH Bloomington	JOHNSON	OTHMAN	PRIEBE
1973	BOYER	WIDSETH	REED	LARSON Detroit Lakes	STROJAN	ARMSTRONG	OTHMAN	PRIEBE
1974	MADSEN Hibbing	SANDERS E. Gr. Forks	KNAPP	LARSON	STROJAN	BOLLANT Winona	OTHMAN	CARLSON
1975	MADSEN	SANDERS	KNAPP	REIMER Moorhead	ASMUS Minnetonka	BOLLANT	MENK St. Peter	CARLSON
1976	BOYER	WIDSETH	KRIHA Brainerd	REIMER	ODLAND	ANDERSON Red Wing	MENK	ADEN Marshall
1977	PFUTZENREUTER Virginia	WIDSETH	KRIHA	RONNING Fergus Falls	ODLAND	ANDERSON	MENK	ADEN
1978	PFUTZENREUTER	WIDSETH	KRIHA	RONNING	BUTCHER Maple Grove	ANDERSON	PUTNAM New Ulm	ADEN
1979	PFUTZENREUTER	VENCEL Bemidji	ENGSTRON Little Falls	RONNING	BUTCHER	ANDERSON	PUTNAM	CARLSON
1980	MADSEN	VENCEL	ENGSTRON	REIMER	BUTCHER	LEUTH Owatonna	PUTNAM	CARLSON
1981	PFUTZENREUTER	WIDSETH	ENGSTRON	REIMER	ASMUS	LEUTH	ORTLOFF Waseca	CARLSON
1982	PFUTZENREUTER Virginia	FREEBERG Bemidji	DOLENTZ St. Cloud	BAKKEN Detroit Lakes	ASMUS	LEUTH	ORTLOFF	ADEN
1983	PRUSAK Cloquet	FREEBERG	DOLENTZ	BAKKEN	ASMUS	PLUMB Rochester	ORTLOFF	ADEN
1984	PRUSAK	FREEBERG	DOLENTZ	BAKKEN	RUDRUD Bloomington	PLUMB	MENK	ADEN
1985	PRUSAK	SANDERS	SCHWENINGER Brainerd	BAKKEN	RUDRUD	PLUMB	MENK	RODEBERG Montevideo
1986	BUSBY Hibbing	SANDERS	SCHWENINGER	EDWARDS Fergus Falls	RUDRUD	MURPHY Austin	MENK	RODEBERG
1987	BUSBY	SANDERS	SCHWENINGER	EDWARDS	OTTENSMANN Coon Rapids	MURPHY	HAFFIELD Worthington	RODEBERG
1988	BUSBY	WALKER Th River Falls	MAURER Elk River	EDWARDS	OTTENSMANN	MURPHY	HAFFIELD	BETTENDORF Litchfield
1989	DRAGISICH Virginia	WALKER	MAURER	MOEN Alexandria	OTTENSMANN	DRAKE Red Wing	HAFFIELD	BETTENDORF
1990	DRAGISICH	WALKER	MAURER	MOEN	EASTLING Richfield	DRAKE	MCCLURG New Ulm	BETTENDORF
1991	PRUSAK Cloquet	KILDAHL Crookston	WILLIAMSON Sauk Rapids	MOEN	EASTLING	DRAKE	MCCLURG	SWANSON Willmar

MUNICIPAL SCREENING COMMITTEE REPRESENTATIVES Districts and First Class Cities

						Vice	
Year	9	Mpls.	St. Paul	Duluth	Chairman	Chairman	Secretary
1972	THENE White Bear Lk	SORENSON	SCHNARR	DAVIDSON	LANGSETH		CARLSON
	winter bear ext				produtingcon		wit c (ma)
1973	THENE	SORENSON	SCHNARR	DAVIDSON	STROJAN		JOHNSON
					Hopkins		Albert Lea
1074	THENE	SOPENSON	SCHNADD	DAVIDSON	CARLSON		
		SORENSON	SUMARK	DATIDGON	Willmar		Brooklyn Park
							·
1975	THENE	SORENSON	SCHNARR	DAVIDSON	JOHNSON		COOK
					Anoka		Faribault
1976	DAVIDSON	SORENSON	SCHNARR	DAVIDSON	MERTIA		ASMUS
1710	Inver Gr. Hgts		John Add	DATIDGON	Brooklyn Park		Minnetonka
1977	DAVIDSON	SORENSON	SCHNARR	DAVIDSON	COOK	ASMUS	THENE
					Faribault	Minnetonka	Wt. Br. Lk.
1978	HONCHELL	SMITH		DAVIDSON	ASMUS	THENE	DRIERE
1970	Roseville	SHITE	WILLELN	DAVIDSON	Minnetonka	Wt. Br. Lk.	Hutchinson
1979	HONCHELL	SMITH	WHEELER	DAVIDSON	PRIEBE	ADEN	BAKER
					Hutchinson	Marshall	Mankato
1980	SIMON	SMITH	UNFEI ER	DAVIDSON	ADEN	RAKER	HONCHELL
.,	S. St. Paul	·····			Marshall	Mankato	Roseville
1981	KLEINSCHMIDT	SMITH	PETERSON	DAVIDSON	BAKER	HONCHELL	SIMON
	Inver Gr. Hgts.	•			Mankato	Roseville	S. St. Paul
1982	KLEINSCHMIDT	HOSHAW	PETERSON	DAVIDSON	HONCHELL	SIMON	REIMER
					Roseville	S. St. Paul	Moorhead
1983	KLEINSCHMIDT	HOSHAW	PETERSON	DAVIDSON	SIMON	REIMER	SPURRIER
					S. St. Paul	Moorhead	Shakopee
1984	GATLIN	HOSHAW	PETERSON	BERG	REIMER	SPURRIER	ANDERSON
	White Bear Lk.				Moorhead	Shakopee	Prior Lake
1985	GATLIN	HOSHAW	PETERSON	CARLSON	SPURRIER	ANDERSON	SAFFERT
					Snakopee	Prior Lake	Mankato
1986	GATLIN	HOSHAW	PETERSON	CARLSON	ANDERSON	SAFFERT	MOORE
					Prior Lake	Mankato	Plymouth
1987	SIGGERUD	HOSHAW	KUHFELD	CARLSON	SAFFERT	MOORE	RUDRUD
	Burnsville				Mankato	Plymouth	Bloomington
1988	SIGGERUD	HOSHAW	KUHFELD	CARLSON	MOORE	RUDRUD	BULLERT
					Plymouth	Bloomington	Northfield
4000							
1989	SIGGERUD	HUSHAW	KUHFELD	LARSON	RUDRUD	BULLERT	GRUBE
					Broomington	NUTURI IELU	St. Louis Park
1990	HAIDER	HOSHAW	KUHFELD	LARSON	BULLERT	GRUBE	EDWARDS
	Maplewood				Northfield	St. Louis Park	Fergus Falls
4004							
1991	HAIDER	HOSHAW	KUHFELD	LARSON	GRUBE	EDWARDS	ALAN GRAY
				21 apr 4	JL. LUUIS Park	iciyus rails	

•

PAGE 4



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: Jim Grube St. Louis Park Chairman -Secretary -Alan Gray Eden Prairie Jim Prusak District 1 -Cloquet District 2 -Crookston David Kildahl District 3 -Sidney Williamson Sauk Rapids District 4 -Alvin Moen Alexandria District -Mike Eastling Richfield Metro West District 6 -Tom Drake Red Wing New Ulm District 7 -Pete McClurg Dale Swanson District 8 -Willmar Kenneth Haider District -Maplewood Metro East First Class City -Kenneth Larson Duluth First Class City -Minneapolis Mary Hoshaw First Class City -Thomas Kuhfeld St. Paul Chairman Needs Study Clyde Busby Hibbing **Subcommittee** Bruce Bullert Unencumbered Savage **Construction Fund Subcommittee** Others: **Dennis** Carlson Director, Office of State Aid Ken Straus Manager, Municipal State Aid Needs Ken Hoeschen Manager, County State Aid Needs District 1 State Aid Engineer Bill Croke District 2 State Aid Engineer Jack Isaacson Dave Reed District 3 State Aid Engineer District 4 State Aid Engineer Tallack Johnson Metro West State Aid Engineer Chuck Weichselbaum District 6 State Aid Engineer Earl Welshons Doug Haeder District 7 State Aid Engineer John Hoeke District 8 State Aid Engineer Elmer Morris 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 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.
- <u>Discussion</u>: 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: 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.
- <u>Discussion</u>: 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.
- <u>Discussion</u>: 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.

<u>Discussion</u>: 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.
- <u>Discussion</u>: 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,

PAGE 20

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).
- <u>Discussion:</u> 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."

<u>Motion:</u> 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 belance after September 1 of that year and inform them of the adjustment will be made to their 25-year 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: 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-of-way 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 CSAH 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,

Alan Gray, Secretary

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

ACTUAL

			25 YEAR		_
APPT	NUMBER OF	MTLEACE	CONST. Needs		ACCUMULATIVE
ILAK	MUNICIPALITIES	MILEAGE		APPORITONMENT	
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	13/2.36	214,086,481	14,28/,//5	
1969	85	1405.35	209,180,115	15, 121, 277	12/,291,3//
19/0	80	1427.59	205,103,981	10,490,004	143,/81,441
19/1	85 02	142/.41	204,034,304	10,090,033 10,220,440	101,0/2,2/4
19/2	92	1490.00	210,/34,01/ 211 102 270	10,330,440	100,210,714
107/	92	157/ 52	321,103,2/3	21 728 373	220 587 607
1075	92	1629 30	419,869,718	22,841,302	243, 428, 999
1976	ăă	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	6/5,158,811
1987	10/	2148.07	551,850,149	53,101,/45	/28,200,550
1988	108	2164.99	555,994,519	58,381,UZZ	/80,041,5/8
1000	109 112	2203.05	060,/10,109 060 725 720	/0,3U1,442 01 517 107	003,143,U2U
1001	112	2203.04	JUJ,/JJ,/LJ 1 200 012 200	01,31/,10/ 70 772 723	744,000,12/ 1 02/ 122 050
1005	115	2330.30 2271 20	1,207,013,237 1,267,017,205	/3,//3,/3C 82 000 000	1 106 122 950
TAAC	* 173	23/1.3X	1,304,01/,303	0L,UUU,UUU	T'TAO'433'03A

*THE 1992 APPORTIONMENT AMOUNT IS ESTIMATED.

PAGE 31

MUNICIPAL STATE-AID 1990 Improved Mileage Record

(BASED ON 1990 CERTIFICATION)

MUNICIPALITY	Mileage	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
MUNICIPALITY	MILEAGE		
-------------------	----------		
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		
Willmar	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 Allowed for Designation	1990 M.S.A.S. Mileage Designated	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	5
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 Allowed for Designation	1990 M.S.A.S. Mileage Designated	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 Little Falls Mahtomedi	5.63 12.66 5.86	5.15 13.80	0.48 -1.14	-1.14
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 Monticello Montevideo	49.06 5.66 8.20	48.33 7.54	0.73 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 Owatonna Plymouth	12.48 18.54 45.63	12.33 17.51 42.55	0.15 1.03 3.08	

Municipality	Mileage Allowed for Designation	1990 M.S.A.S. Mileage Designated	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	-0.32
Richfield	26.29	26.18	0.11	
Robbinsdale	10.01	10.33	-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 Virginia Waite Park	6.86 12.38 3.68	5.59 11.99	1.27 0.39	
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.

1992 THEORETICAL POPULATION APPORTIONMENT

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."

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.

D -

MUNICIPALITIES	POPULATION	APPORTIONMENT
ALBERT LEA CALEXANDRIA	18,310	\$267,867
ALEXANDRIA	7,838	114,666
ANDOVER	15,216	222,603
Anoka	17,192	251,511
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	86,335	1,263,043
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	18,910	276,645
Coon Rapids	52,978	775,045
Corcoran	5,199	76,059
Cottage Grove	22,935	335,529
Crookston	8,119	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

MUNICIPALITIES	POPULATION	POPULATION Apportionment
Edina	46,070	\$673,984
Elk River	11,143	163,017
Fairmont	11,265	164,802
Falcon Heights	5,380	78,707
Faribault	17,085	249,946
Farmington	5,940	86,900
Fergus Falls	12,362	180,851
Forest Lake	5,833	85,334
Fridley	28,335	414,529
Golden Valley	20,971	306,797
Grand Rapids	7,976	116,685
Ham Lake	8,924	130,554
HASTINGS	15,445	225,954
Hermantown	6,761	98,910
Hibbing	18,046	264,005
HOPKINS	16,534	241,885
Hutchinson	11,523	168,576
International Falls	8,325	121,791
Inver Grove Heights	22,477	328,829
Lake Elmo	5,903	86,358
Lakeville	24,854	363,603
LINO LAKES	8,807	128,843
LITCHFIELD	6,041	88,377
LITTLE CANADA	8,971	131,242
LITTLE FALLS	7,232	105,801
Mahtomedi	5,569	81,472
Mankato	31,477	460,495
Maple Grove	38,736	566,691
Maplewood	30,954	452,843
Marshall	12,023	175,891
Mendota Heights	9,431	137,971
Minneapolis	368,383	5,389,281
Minnetonka	48,370	707,632
Monticello Montevideo Moorhead	5,499 32,295	0 80,448 472,462
Morris	5,613	82,116
Mound	9,634	140,941
Mounds View	12,541	183,469
New Brighton	22,207	324,879
New Hope	21,853	319,700
New Ulm	13,132	192,115
Northfield	14,684	214,820
North Mankato	10,164	148,695
North St. Paul	12,376	181,055

.

MUNICIPALITIES	POPULATION	POPULATION Apportionment
Oakdale	18,374	\$268,804
Orono	7,285	106,576
Otsego	5,219	76,352
OWATONNA	19,386	283,609
Plymouth	50,889	744,484
Prior Lake	11,482	167,977
Ramsey	12,408	181,524
Red Wing	15,134	221,404
Richfield	35,710	522,422
ROBBINSDALE	14,396	210,607
Rochester	70,997	1,038,655
Rosemount	8,622	126,136
ROSEVILLE	33,485	489,871
St. Anthony	7,727	113,043
St. Cloud	48,812	714,098
St. Louis Park	43,787	640,585
St. Paul	272,235	3,982,678
St. Peter	9,421	137,825
Sartell	5,393	78,897
Sauk Rapids	7,825	114,476
Savage	9,906	144,920
SHAKOPEE	11,739	171,736
Shoreview	24,587	359,697
Shorewood	5,917	86,563
South St. Paul	20,197	295,473
Spring Lake Park	6,532	95,560
Stillwater	13,882	203,088
THIEF RIVER FALLS	8,010	117,183
Vadnais Heights	11,041	161,525
Virginia	9,410	137,664
Waite Park	5,020	73,440
Waseca	8,385	122,669
West St. Paul	19,248	281,590
WHITE BEAR LAKE	24,704	361,409
Willmar	17,531	256,471
Winona	25,399	371,576
Woodbury	20,075	293,688
Worthington	9,977	145,959
TOTAL	2,802,545	\$41,000,000

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

\$41,000,000	FOULLS	\$1 <i>1</i> 620550018	DED DEDSAN
2,802,545	LUUALS	¥14.029339910	FER FERJOR

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					
0 - 4,999	+	\$	3,750	per	mile
5,000 - 9,999	+	Ś	7,500	per	mile
10,000 & over	+	\$	30,000	per	mile
Railroad signs	+	\$	100	per	sign
Railroad Signals - low speed	+	Ś	5,000	per	signal
Rubberized railroad crossing mat.	+	\$	100	per	ft. of track

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	1990 M.S.A.S. Needs	ACCOMPLISH. & System Revisions	Unit Cost Update	1991 M.S.A.S. Needs	Net Change	% Change 1990 то 1991
Albert Lea	\$8,909,231	\$744,273	\$290,264	\$9,943,768	\$1,034,537	11.6120%
Alexandria	5,903,657	913,460	100,246	6,917,363	1,013,706	17.1708%
Andover	12,348,478	143,382	241,727	12,733,587	385,109	3.1187%
Anoka	5,441,022	0	87,805	5,528,827	87,805	1.6138%
Apple Valley	10,461,604	2,150,331	448,852	13,060,787	2,599,183	24.8450%
Arden Hills	2,241,582	0	58,734	2,300,316	58,734	2.6202%
Austin	16,903,865	(508,583)	322,584	16,717,866	(185,999)	-1.1003%
Bemidji	8,473,906	249,361	166,705	8,889,972	416,066	4.9100%
Blaine	13,306,177	(1,444,474)	373,085	12,234,788	(1,071,389)	-8.0518%
BLOOMINGTON	54,001,471	2,782,546	1,543,277	58,327,294	4,325,823	8.0106%
Brainerd	5,211,119	491,690	122,535	5,825,344	614,225	11.7868%
Brooklyn Center	12,434,351	6,801	351,964	12,793,116	358,765	2.8853%
Brooklyn Park	15,398,227	126,124	522,837	16,047,188	648,961	4.2145%
Buffalo	4,425,051	0	75,602	4,500,653	75,602	1.7085%
Burnsville	15,971,115	675,596	744,896	17,391,607	1,420,492	8.8941%
Cambridge	0	0	0	828,058	828,058	0.0000%
Champlin	4,630,638	0	70,113	4,700,751	70,113	1.5141%
Chanhassen	5,465,563	349,580	111,387	5,926,530	460,967	8.4340%
CHASKA	5,198,745	(306,171)	64,812	4,957,386	(241,359)	-4.6426%
Chisholm	4,101,019	(257,395)	43,976	3,887,600	(213,419)	-5.2040%
Cloquet	10,962,925	509,039	129,299	11,601,263	638,338	5.8227%
Columbia Heights	6,991,496	(371,650)	155,914	6,775,760	(215,736)	-3.0857%
Coon Rapids	13,034,701	1,083,304	345,327	14,463,332	1,428,631	10.9602%
Corcoran	5,738,810	(351,675)	93,953	5,481,088	(257,722)	-4.4909%
Cottage Grove	12,515,871	(254,886)	331,717	12,592,702	76,831	0.6139%
Crookston	4,819,782	558,497	57,917	5,436,196	616,414	12.7893%
Crystal	7,616,699	2,307,310	200,755	10,124,764	2,508,065	32.9285%

MUNICIPALITY	1990 M.S.A.S. Needs	ACCOMPLISH. & System Revisions	Unit Cost Update	1991 M.S.A.S. Needs	Net Change	% Change 1990 то 1991
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	0	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	790,301	12.9200%
Fergus Falls	7,300,675	428,906	25,464	7,755,045	454,370	6.2237%
Forest Lake	2,104,731	596,882	27,462	2,729,075	624,344	29.6638%
Fridley	9,790,740	0	202,576	9,993,316	202,576	2.0691%
Golden Valley	13,440,109	861,398	292,913	14,594,420	1,154,311	8.5886%
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 Hutchinson International Falls	5,429,434 4,361,769 4,898,531	621,107 0	161,649 143,425 55,916	5,591,083 5,126,301 4,954,447	161,649 764,532 55,916	2.9773% 17.5280% 1.1415%
Inver Grove Heights	7,181,757	1,101,204	99,327	8,382,288	1,200,531	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	0	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	1990 M.S.A.S. Needs	ACCOMPLISH. & System Revisions	Unit Cost Update	1991 M.S.A.S. Needs	Net Change	% Change 1990 то 1991
LITTLE FALLS	\$6,900,604	(\$320,730)	\$127,501	\$6,707,375	(\$193,229)	-2.8002%
Mahtomedi	0	1,804,507	30,946	1,835,453	1,835,453	0.0000%
Mankato	14,149,365	1,087,140	452,507	15,689,012	1,539,647	10.8814%
Maple Grove	17,030,547	2,939,531	337,026	20,307,104	3,276,557	19.2393%
Maplewood	9,959,204	(355,133)	186,431	9,790,502	(168,702)	-1.6939%
Marshall	3,586,247	(446,344)	60,335	3,200,238	(386,009)	-10.7636%
Mendota Heights	3,825,867	248,129	74,624	4,148,620	322,753	8.4361%
Minneapolis	165,041,999	(1,506,057)	3,815,332	167,351,274	2,309,275	1.3992%
Minnetonka	24,491,128	1,453,329	459,175	26,403,632	1,912,504	7.8090%
Montevideo	2,974,069	(141,366)	44,737	2,877,440	(96,629)	-3.2491%
Moorhead	12,693,493	(133,807)	276,745	12,836,431	142,938	1.1261%
Morris	2,523,909	(11,512)	40,146	2,552,543	28,634	1.1345%
Mound	2,986,852	170,318	52,859	3,210,029	223,177	7.4720%
Mounds View	2,341,822	(216,343)	45,681	2,171,160	(170,662)	-7.2876%
New Brighton	6,278,485	326,577	122,144	6,727,206	448,721	7.1470%
New Hope	7,765,074	331,637	256,439	8,353,150	588,076	7.5733%
New Ulm	5,762,204	1,756,512	55,273	7,573,989	1,811,785	31.4426%
Northfield	6,840,707	(10,117)	157,739	6,988,329	147,622	2.1580%
North Mankato	3,454,149	(47,235)	77,068	3,483,982	29,833	0.8637%
North St. Paul	2,839,889	52,087	69,437	2,961,413	121,524	4.2792%
Oakdale	5,630,525	1,331,677	111,746	7,073,948	1,443,423	25.6357%
Orono	5,673,314	582,360	93,758	6,349,432	676,118	11.9175%
Otsego	7,990,295	0	99,809	8,090,104	99,809	1.2491%
Owatonna	11,640,531	(366,193)	180,527	11,454,865	(185,666)	-1.5950%
Plymouth	17,396,123	3,321,021	602,426	21,319,570	3,923,447	22.5536%
Prior Lake	6,096,745	(95,051)	91,912	6,093,606	(3,139)	-0.0515%
Ramsey	9,014,357	(1,027,762)	156,198	8,142,793	(871,564)	-9.6686%
RED WING	12,724,737	(69,013)	242,057	12,897,781	173,044	1.3599%
Richfield	11,088,521	4,019,935	391,045	15,499,501	4,410,980	39.7797%
Robbinsdale	4,554,954	234,770	186,480	4,976,204	421,250	9.2482%

MUNICIPALITY	1990 M.S.A.S. Needs	ACCOMPLISH & System Revisions	Unit Cosi Update	1991 r M.S.A.S. Needs	Net Change	% Снанде 1990 то 1991
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 St. Cloud St. Louis Park	1,211,834 16,694,253 12,739,298	(197,473) 0	58,852 656,211 356,163	1,270,686 17,152,991 13,095,461	58,852 458,738 356,163	4.8564% 2.7479% 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	0	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%
Willmar	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	\$49,351,710	\$30,885,250	\$1,364,817,385	\$80,236,960	6.2462%

٠

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 <u>does not</u> 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.

MUNICIPAL NAME	GRADING	COMP SEWER	ADJ SEWER	BASE	SURFACE	SHOULDER	CURB&GUTTER	SIDEWALK	SIGNALS	LIGHTING	RET WALLS	BRIDGES	RR CROSSING	ENGINEERING	MAINT	NEEDS	MILEAGE	COST/MIL	MUNICIPAL NAME
ALBERT LEA Alexandria Andover	1,294,168 961,498 972,657	270,480 793,800 2,773,400	390,600 155,000	1,658,772 1,246,350 1,002,760	1,642,211 1,254,284 1,756,779	6,265 35,098	557,568 372,480 757,545	625,520 492,366 2,216,592	510,018 333,759 610,327	280,160 190,240 477,600	19,000		1,087,800	1,511,661 1,045,100 1,928,300	106,936 66,236 92,532	9,943,768 6,917,363 12,733,587	17.51 11.89 29.85	567,891 581,780 426,586	ALBERT LEA ALEXANDRIA ANDOVER
ANDKA Apple Valley Arden Hills	591,452 780,831 202,080	1,142,630 1,689,520 511,560	8,680 171,120 620	617,106 1,780,330 383,775	962,023 2,587,094 353,869		466,847 654,689 172,745	382,396 1,500,632 57,806	270,771 1,349,251 167,251	190,240 434,240 82,880				833,805 1,970,691 347,882	62,836 142,492 19,864	5,528,827 13,060,787 2,300,316	11.89 27.14 5.18	464,998 481,238 444,076	ANDKA Apple Valley Arden Hills
AUSTIN BEMIDJI BLAINE	2,709,872 817,239 1,238,426	633,080 1,070,160 1,795,360	347,200 76,880	2,004,678 1,044,592 1,571,108	2,069,193 1,533,639 2,170,103	62,076	757,069 501,944 520,345	1,090,600 716,982 1,392,916	695,079 461,449 1,018,130	359,520 230,560 501,920	1,0,000	3,060,170 588,120	309,600	2,532,486 1,374,283 1,849,175	155,316 88,864 115,732	16,717,866 8,889,972 12,234,788	22.47 14.41 31.37	607,819 576,117 390,016	AUSTIN BEMIDJI BLAINE
BLOOMINGTON BRAINERD BROOKLYN CENTER	4,989,537 731,882 936,971	7,616,560 207,760 1,581,720	477,400 375,100 519,560	8,624,486 816,561 2,020,590	12,451,229 1,296,732 2,864,058		2,509,696 391,688 595,940	3,372,698 219,828 629,272	3,695,642 357,575 922,508	1,166,240 227,040 340,800	16,000	2,875,760	1,175,400 240,000	8,830,729 876,732 1,931,669	541,924 85,628 129,964	58,327,294 5,825,344 12,793,116	72.89 14.19 21.30	760,756 410,525 587,602	BLOOMINGTON BRAINERD BROOKLYN CENTER
BROOKLYN PARK BUFFALO BURNSVILLE	1,088,633 432,518 1,796,644	2,918,440 484,120 852,600	179,180 48,980 168,640	1,790,295 717,526 2,723,892	3,244,200 555,989 3,795,175		1,017,393 329,892 1,064,940	1,060,976 392,196 1,264,508	1,566,382 121,884 2,122,134	582,720 93,120 679.680	50,000		564,600	2,477,480 683,393 2,780,612	178,288 27,480 319,120	16,047,188 4,500,653 17,391,607	37.96 5.82 42.48	422,739 773,308 409,407	BROOKLYN PARK Buffalo Burnsville
CHAMPLIN CHANHASSEN CHASKA	222,555 552,278 207.864	799,680 672,280	8,060	320,434 1,118,884 769,205	890,190 1,302,100 786,650	8,841	359,187 251,747 369 566	868,434 161,168	263,446	205,600	180,000	25,080	80,000	721,722	54,400 48,472	4,700,751 5,926,530 6,957,386	13.39 13.31 8 59	351,064 443,385 569,159	CHAMPLIN CHANHASSEN CHASKA
CHISHOLM CLOQUET	719,449 1,972,886	697,760 2,087,400	19,220	563,576 1,543,904	482,932 1,383,087	8,022	250,225 624,064	291,872 853,510	353,458	284,320	42,000	336,600	270,000	587,856 1,757,034	33,876 85,344	3,887,600	6.93 17.77	560,981 633,915	CHISHOLM CLOQUET
COON RAPIDS CORCORAN	800,429 1,170,151	1,291,640 638,960	198,400	1,220,096 1,202,204	3,062,681 547,223	49,105	518,297 749,480 188,931	6,734 1,190,028 267,050	385,509 1,308,764 249,756	182,560 616,640 209,920	350,000	1,435,776	185,300	2,213,487 828,596	73,260 233,432 49,192	6,775,780 14,463,332 5,481,088	38.54 13.12	338,027 417,766	COON RAPIDS CORCORAN
CRIVAGE GRUVE CROOKSTON CRYSTAL	908,094 619,701 1,056,592	1,911,000 662,480 1,818,880	62,620 73,780 155,000	1,678,036 764,659 1,747,524	1,877,019 736,358 1,720,209	16,492 175	682,988 302,131 860,182	1,571,626 613,914 273,770	924,566 186,019 445,141	396,160 148,000 286,080	5,000 32,900	520,000 450,000	500 113,700	1,899,038 1,657,812 1,531,831	145,352 52,396 82,780	12,592,702 5,436,196 10,124,764	24.76 10.83 17.88	487,589 460,406 566,262	CDITAGE GROVE CROOKSTON CRYSTAL
DETROIT LAKES Duluth Eagan	325,114 8,739,793 881,643	623,280 5,621,280 2,028,600	24,800 969,060 151,280	408,385 10,193,375 1,993,113	716,470 8,318,365 3,518,602	119 68,516	182,881 2,743,000 1,029,859	349,566 2,729,846 699,482	237,570 2,885,501 1,623,756	144,160 1,434,880 650,240	154,000	35,530 6,675,740	283,900 333,900	599,724 9,181,041 2,276,799	53,356 541,076 247,408	3,984,855 60,564,452 15,087,764	9.01 89.68 40.64	438,327 600,900 371,254	DETROIT LAKES DULUTH EAGAN
EAST BETHEL EAST GRAND FORKS EDEN PRAIRIE	510,105 297,461 1,612,898	444,920 3,512,320	394,940	613,731 356,222 2,964,417	665,758 684,897 4,200,811	89,131	152,687 1,442,296	50,232 701,120	407,440 259,513 1,621,317	347,680 173,120 598,400	20,000 489,500	308,000	220,500 110,000	477,691 478,855 3,613,087	75,920 60,464 187,064	3,207,456 3,175,141 21,375,168	21.73 10.82 37.40	147,605 293,451 563,293	EAST BETHEL EAST GRAND FORKS EDEN PRAIRIE
EDINA ELK RIVER	2,219,816 651,880	1,373,960 1,387,680	599,540	3,245,373 977,088	4,109,788 1,234,393	26,439	1,367,256 431,489	967,470 599,494	1,728,761 480,007	621,920 335,360	154,600 8,000	166,650 894,000	30,600 110,000	3,132,900 1,360,686	226,716 87,808	19,797,883 8,508,091	38.95 20.96	504,011 363,268	EDINA ELK RIVER
FAIRMONT FALCON HEIGHTS FARIBAULT	1,572,153 49,898 925,188	2,024,680 119,560 209,720	3,720 103,540	1,950,357 91,138 1,472,514	2,103,170 149,229 1,872,352	1,260	656,160 45,623 402,915	829,262 25,900 1,471,834	558,382 54,941 613,695	278,080 40,640 289,120	3,000	448,800 1,331,280	80,500	1,891,056 104,517 1,642,208	110,916 12,628 111,464	12,507,765 697,794 10,840,213	17.38 2.54 18.07	693,841 274,722 526,228	FAIRMONT Falcon Heights Faribault
FARMINGTON FERGUS FALLS FOREST LAKE	608,064 722,524 348,638	1,244,600 519,400 535,080	162,440 18,600	1,286,887 818,539 495,440	1,077,674 941,748 ⁷ 353,631	2,667	368,811 331,542 211,670	515,200 462,266 Zu4,008	233,626 344,263 76,129	107,200 196,480 59,040	15,500	208,437 629,240	184,800 1,371,400	1,246,208 1,262,838 420,422	21,516 63,792 12,436	6,907,169 7,755,045 2,729,075	6.70 12.28 5.69	999,811 580,277 739,587	FARMINGTON FERGUS FALLS FOREST LAKE
GOLDEN VALLEY	899,882 1,730,696 544,328	1,711,080 1,971,760 656,600	107,880 368,280 57,660	1,299,300 2,397,920 640,309	2,147,841 2,303,041 995.479	7;294	735,748 875,619	378,224	651,398 759,947	385,280 378,080	10,000	380,000	410,000 700,200 260,000	1,504,033 2,205,677	133,580 134,976	9,993,316 14,594,420	24.08 23.63	415,005 601,541	FRIDLEY GOLDEN VALLEY
HAM LAKE HASTINGS HERMANTOWN	414,575 439,609 733.432	219,520 944,720	18,600 22,320	608,248 568,292	727,289 861,721	68,768 1,428	167,624 313,788	234,444	373,509 290,823	318,720 198,880	9,000		61,200	525,033 710,327	71,524 72,400	3,513,410 4,728,948	19.92	176,376	HAM LAKE HASTINGS
HIBBING HOPKINS	4,040,408 628,715	2,408,840 503,720	195,920 74,400	1,200,919 4,268,257 1,094,233	2,673,427 1,222,272	1,127 103,803	431,866 953,753 305,897	240,660 725,298 174,076	283,128 959,839 469,127	207,840 768,480 150,560	25,000	16,320 67,770	934,000	1,024,740 3,253,774 844,379	57,900 219,496 55,976	6,740,236 21,516,543 5,591,083	12.99 48.03 9.41	518,879 447,642 586,962	HERMANIOWN HIBBING HOPKINS
HUTCHINSON INTERNATIONAL FALLS INVER GROVE HEIGHTS	358,787 752,270 475,951	397,880 452,760 1,679,720	56,420 230,640 141,980	556,250 911,759 1,193,621	882,668 707,746 1,434,927		169,285 360,571 694,027	126,574 471,212 653,394	269,632 151,887 454,132	169,280 126,240 300,000		867,320	436,200	772,685 749,718 1,300,705	63,748 39,644 89,536	5,126,301 4,954,447 8,382,288	10.58 7.89 18.75	402,550 627,940 447,055	HUTCHINSON INTERNATIONAL FALLS INVER GROVE HEIGHTS
LAKE ELMO LAKEVILLE LINO LAKES	238,349 1,616,270 862,418	368,480 4,159,120 1,475,880	27,900	597,757 3,450,545 1,597,003	446,505 3,594,386 995,018	40,404 3,262 32,368	135,163 1,413,651 437,174	106,890 901,530	178,692 861,946 283,507	152,480 547,360 241,920	36,000	,	357,900	421,311 3,235,345 1,117,281	38,120 129,176 37,396	2,785,891 20,078,222 7,029,237	9.53 34.21 15.12	292,329 586,911 464,897	LAKE ELMO LAKEVILLE LINO LAKES
LITCHFIELD LITTLE CANADA LITTLE FALLS	443,885 158,570 679,229	772,240 141,120 815,360	75,020 81,220 170,500	677,070 278,184 1,006,974	612,259 361,712 1,276,333		333,586 117,904 493,085	63,112 422,982 592,018	146,828 130,504 364,138	125,280 82,400 220,320			129,200	585,480 342,685 1,012,274	38,396 29,428 77,592	3,872,550 2,275,909 6,707,375	7.83 5.15 13.77	494,579 441,924 487,101	LITCHFIELD LITTLE CANADA LITTLE FALLS
MAHTOMEDI MANKATO MAPLE GROVE MAPLEWOOD	156,915 1,869,157 1,659,455 595,571	364,560 1,532,720 3,708,320	295,740 33,480	368,277 2,580,990 3,265,510	230,359 2,856,224 3,348,247	8,029	108,229 753,075 1,257,376	93,002 881,216 1,771,252	89,628 1,239,006 1,067,822	76,480 401,440 583,840	45,000 727,000 184,750		197,400	322,286 2,505,527 3,161,802	17,688 187,860 155,004	1,835,453 15,689,012 20,307,104	4.78 25.83 36.99	383,986 607,395 548,989	MAHTOMEDI Mankato Maple grove
MARSHALL MENDOTA HEIGHTS MINNEAPOLIS	322,833 250,740 26,864,195	239,120 474,320 7,718,480	53,940 58,900 2,267,360	429,457 658,973	782,671 838,563	2,856	180,467 295,037	212,772 371,476	582,385 264,194 242,442	163,520 167,520		26 270 254	110,000	477,328 624,237	71,080 56,412	3,200,238 4,148,620	10.22 10.47	313,135 396,239	MARSHALL Mendota Heights
MINNETONKA MONTEVIDEO MONPUEAD	2,736,222	3,457,440 299,880	128,960 76,880	4,859,113 467,318	4,323,599 567,137		2,118,558 170,514	9,437,134 1,679,580 104,062	8,391,443 1,344,023 163,134	791,040	398,500 39,000	24,119,256	355,000	4,113,514 432,746	217,032 42,204	26,403,632 2,877,440	49.44 7.53	759,817 534,054 382,130	MINNETONKA MONTEVIDEO
MORRIS	306,516 281,694	360,640 207,760	50,840 119,040	2,689,240 490,257 417,764	2,383,092 474,731 642,397		900,023 197,910 302,046	586,516 28,322 272,370	830,642 120,943 176,075	387,040 103,200 128,160	60,000	229,320	190,000 80,500	1,931,787 384,094 483,803	173,416 35,180 38,420	12,836,431 2,552,543 3,210,029	24.19 6.45 8.01	521,170 395,743 400,753	MOORHEAD Morris Mound
MOUNDS VIEW NEW BRIGHTON NEW HOPE	266,836 787,638 770,566	33,320 382,200 11,760	113,460 458,800	471,579 1,489,450 1,121,106	567,546 1,276,827 1,705,155	8,946	189,510 477,233 443,058	13,062 19,656 837,956	148,881	115,840 215,360 198,080	10,000	564.000	540,500 287,400	325,182 1,034,475 1,261,753	39,404 66,216 81,708	2,171,160 6,727,206 8,353,150	7.24 13.46 12.38	299,884 499,792 629,172	MOUNDS VIEW New Brighton New Hope
NEW ULM Northfield North Mankato	896,872 750,147 347,869	727,160 1,015,280 321,440	66,960 27,900 61,380	1,058,894 948,044 616,768	1,170,410 944,084 776 761	4,354	469,153 360,732	470,414 501,228	263,445	226,080 161,760	94,000 2,000	512,000	320,000	1,261,141	56,748	7,573,989 6,988,329	14.13	499,787 691,229	NEW ULM
NORTH ST PAUL Oak dale Ordno	376,816 732,359	219,520 856,520	62,000	587,514 1,179,955	637,374	14,091	243,272 509,295	176,512 19,880 717,878	293,441 195,197 405,006	148,400 130,240 243,840	35,000			445,596	69,116	2,961,413 7,073,948	9.15 8.14 15.24	363,810	NORTH MANKATU NORTH ST PAUL DAK DALE
OTSEGO OWATONNA	1,096,711 1,175,340	1,208,180 1,609,160 1,197,560	49,600	1,047,574 1,596,682 1,495,150	684,472 903,331 1,538,035	37,058 41,678	375,221 476,803 615,768	583,184 674,268 1,095,458	222,566 231,191 396,207	175,040 197,280 280,320		261,800 920,000	171,200 862,200	961,896 1,228,880 1,741,783	44,000 34,120 96,612	6,349,432 8,090,104 11,454,865	10.94 12.33 17.52	556,456 656,132 601,305	ORONO DTSEGO OWATONNA
PLYMOUTH PRIOR LAKE RAMSEY	1,852,121 788,260 975,592	2,671,480 960,400 1,285,760	78,740	4,118,447 1,211,303 771,600	4,775,661 899,827 1,411,341	28,602 71,680	1,359,462 376,786 413,244	423,878 1,033,256	1,837,882 244,509 474,392	725,600 200,960 400,320			460,000	3,218,293 946,449 1,230,692	221,884 34,864 74,916	21,319,570 6,093,606 8,142,793	45.35 12.56 25.02	470,112 485,160 325,451	PLYMOUTH Prior Lake Ramsey
RED WING RICHFIELD	2,039,158	1,756,160 868,280	141,360 184,140	2,014,585 1,163,562	1,857,502 2,683,816	7,525 2,849	760,984	855,358 825,132	493,891 993,008	324,480 418,720	373,500 2,754,277		222,700 672,100	1,999,016 2,340,902	98,080 153,600	12,897,781 15,499,501	20.28 26.17	635,985 592,262	RED WING RICHFIELD
ROBBINSDALE ROCHESTER ROSEMOUNT	356,860 3,942,305 679,716	252,840 844,760 1,550,360	138,260 902,720 31,000	527,002 6,096,047 1,534,136	934,364 6,195,035 1,649,633	16,597	237,801 1,514,556 605,926	132,370 1,311,772 237,006	497,631 2,283,009 519,190	165,280 721,600 263,200	10,000	857,640 3,201,664	55,000 1,023,700 300,000	806,397 5,158,368 1,326,632	61,444 306,816 67,248	4,976,204 33,410,261 8,764,047	10.33 45.10 16.45	398,699 669,814 532,769	ROBBINSDALE ROCHESTER ROSEMOUNT
ROSEVILLE St anthony St cloud	344,232 98,961 1,712,556	450,800 121,520 1,277,920	95,480 24,180 327,360	746,850 116,852 2,595,207	1,474,090 288,267 3,718,216		308,348 78,750 915,565	584,486 42,056 1,203,888	593,825 196,315 1,727,447	358,080 82,880 527,200			320,000 330,000	949,713 189,100 2,948,439	115,272 31,944 237,256	6,341,176 1,270,686 17,152,991	22.38 5.18 35.28	283,341 245,306 486,196	ROSEVILLE ST ANTHONY ST CLOUD
ST LOUIS PARK ST PAUL ST PETER	1,365,825 19,284,861 317,000	844,760 13,529,880 401,800	500,960 1,292,080 6,820	1,793,025 21,749,288 515,090	2,717,288 22,110,122 629,230		897,142 6,752,005 224,029	491,932 6,732,348 310,450	991,888 7,828,911 167,073	404,320 2,515,520 139,360	33,750 97,500	629,910 19,802,150	295,800 2,315,500	2,226,397 22,938,056 491,205	154,872 1,120,412 49,484	13,095,461 147,452,421 3,248,291	25.27 157.22 8.71	493,294 811,921 372,938	ST LOUIS PARK ST PAUL ST PETER
SARTELL SAUK RAPIDS SAVAGE	206,599 480,576 703,287	731,080	50,220 28,520 25,420	299,916 613,671 1,455,926	347,171 863,657 1,376,770		231,129 278,077 617,636	326,844 167,300 664,454	75,004 252,194 357,760	64,000 126,880 191,520	40,000	646,339		288,459 646,375 1,415,144	13,680 52,900 35,560	1,902,723 4,279,608 9,312,616	4.00 7.93 11.97	475,681 539,673 724,000	SARTELL SAUK RAPIDS SAVAGE
SHAKOPEE Shoreview Shorewood	948,601 335,135 421,428	1,287,720 780,080 1,699,320	83,700	1,286,048 493,263 840,212	1,287,986 872,574 701,405	20,923	338,956 294,130 514,413	509,908 28,700 163,310	335,443 270,943 • 216,752	242,400 201,440 168,660			926,600	1,309,910 589,732 849,107	68,416 48,344 36,680	8,644,990 3,914,341 5,603,047	15.15 12.59 9.29	570,626 310,909 603,127	SHAKOPEE Shoreview Shorewood
SOUTH ST PAUL SPRING LAKE PARK STILLWATER	1,041,726 135,921 865,389	517,440 94,080 952,560	202,740 86,800 86,800	1,382,237 190,059 1,072,079	1,436,344 369,044 1,190,111	77	451,129 108,841 471,242	676,606 296,198 450,268	368,640 127,315 395,071	229,280	10,000		110 000	1,137,893 267,090	79,700 23,608	7,532,748 1,773,899	14.33 4.69	525,663 378,230	SOUTH ST PAUL Spring lake park Stillwatep
THIEF RIVER FALLS VADNAIS HEIGHTS	805,972 192,541	1,185,800 488,040	46,500	1,158,881 357,184	1,003,995 357,860	0.507	432,527 186,445	302,274 48,622	229,328	179,360 179,360 89,440	347,741		709,800	1,306,411 1,306,414 328,496	60,344 64,120 21,640	7,208,359 2,175,077	12.31 11.21 5.59	643,029 389,101	THIEF RIVER FALLS VADNAIS HEIGHTS
WASECA WEST ST PAUL	043,312 240,052 444,693	527,520 176,400 831,040	63,860 9,300	0/0,16/ 194,795 799,737	978,206 420,760 948,675	7 ;577	045,662 91,152 345,765	228,956 4,270 270,172	324,758 120,763 315,948	196,000 100,960 185,920	23,000		475,500 111,000	951,158 262,828 756,268	65,988 39,088 68,412	5,578,164 1,762,068 4,994,026	12.25 6.31 11.62	455,360 279,250 429,778	VIRGINIA WASECA WEST ST PAUL
WHITE BEAR LAKE WILLMAR WINONA	1,047,824 958,050 1,497,528	1,242,640 1,718,920 682,080	244,280 56,420 132,680	1,644,705 1,476,532 1,487,636	1,507,360 1,472,916 2,371,453	3,934 5,614	686,672 600,927 632,238	769,734 263,284 513,324	481,885 444,388 895,884	285,120 311,040 314,560		110,770	110,000 220,000	1,445,516 1,374,694 1,558,571	89,044 113,748 123,660	9,552,905 9,125,623 10,192,600	17.82 19.44 19.66	536,078 463,727 518,444	WHITE BEAR LAKE WILLMAR WINONA
WOODBURY Worthington	1,371,375 1,148,583	2,516,640 147,000 148,569,960	48,360 166,780	2,989,519 976,918 205,324,154	3,218,241 855,160	11,641 934,129	1,163,424 391,560	1,399,832 32,340 79,574,222	975,940 219,012	386,880 156,800	6,987,385	656,600	29,851,050	2,534,749 934,961	92,932 56,592 13,256,720	16,709,519 5,662,476	24.18 9.80 2,362.10	691,047 510,804	WOODBURY Worthington
	, <u>,uu</u> ,,a23		~,,u-12,06U		UUUV 		· -) C 7 O ; O 6 C			57,676,640		74,837,552		211,694,105	1	,363,446,144			

COMPARISON OF NEEDS BETWEEN 1990 AND 1991

ے ہے یے او ایک کا چاہد کی جاتے ہیں کا بنا کا کا

		Complete				Total	
Needs Year	Grading	Storm Sewer	Sewer Adjustment	Base Needs	Surface Needs	Shoulder 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
8	3.59%	2.19%	9.58%	5.29%	0.71%	10.61%	3.17%

Needs Year	Sidewalk Construction	Traffic Signal Construction	Street Lighting Construction	Retaining Walls	Total Bridge Needs	Railroad Crossing Needs	Engineering
1991	\$79,574,222	\$80,398,370	\$37,676,640	\$6,987,385	\$74,837,552	\$29,851,050	\$211,694,105
1990	68,675,194	56,670,000	36,994,240	3,254,283	75,378,327	24,359,750	198,513,528
Difference	\$10,899,028	\$23,728,370	\$682,400	\$3,733,102	(\$540,775)	\$5,491,300	\$13,180,577
£	13.70%	29.51%	1.81%	53.43%	-0.72%	18.40%	6.23%

Needs Year	Total Maintenance Needs	Total Apportionment Cost	Total Mileage	After the fact Right of way Needs	After the fact Bridge Needs	Overall Apportionment Needs	Needs To Apport. Ratio
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	\$249,220	\$82,246,083	44.13	\$2,023,410	\$0	\$41,064,411	
ę	1.88%	6.03%	1.87%	6.82%	0.00%	3.11%	

* 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,

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

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 special 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.

Dan Edwards Vice Chairman Alan Gray Secretary JIM GRUBE CHAIRMAN APPROVED BY: _____ _____ -----David Kildahl District 2 SIDNEY WILLIAMSON JIM PRUSAK DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 3 THOMAS DRAKE MICHAEL EASTLING District 5 Alvin Moen District 4 DISTRICT 6 ------PETE MCCLURG District 7 Dale Swanson District 8 Kenneth Haider DISTRICT 9 -----_____ THOMAS KUHFELD Kenneth Larson Duluth Marv Hoshaw MINNEAPOLIS St. Paul ATTACHMENT: MONEY NEEDS LISTING

PAGE 49

1991 MONEY NEEDS RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1991 Money Needs Recommendations

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	\$1,364,817,385

1991 MUNICIPAL STATE AID NEEDS REPORT

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.

TENATIVE DETERMINATION OF THE 1992 CONSTRUCTION NEEDS APPORTIONMEN

	Municipality	1991 Actual 25-Year Const. Needs	Excess Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance Deduction	Unencumbered Construction Fund Balance Deduction	(-) Expend. Off-State Aid System	(+ or -) Bond Account Adjustment	(+) Non- Existing Bridge Adjustment	(+) R/W Acquisition Adjustment	(-) Bituminous Overlay And Concrete Joint Repair	(-) Variance Adjustments	Total affect of Adjustments	Adjusted 25-Year Const. Needs	Money Needs Apport. Minus (THTB Adj.)	(+) Turnback Maintenance Adjustment	1992 Money Needs Apport.	≯ Of Total Dist.
	Albert Lea Alexandria Andover Anoka Apple Valley	\$9,943,768 6,917,363 12,733,587 5,528,827 13,060,787		(\$643, 344) (122, 650) (123, 107)	(\$279, 963) (161, 571) (113, 955) (52, 383) (230, 701)	\$610,000 (355,000) 670,000	\$245, 320 	147, 283 28, 974	(\$85,966) (14,214)		(\$677, 987) (370, 187) 643, 328 (515, 730) 439, 299	\$9,265,781 6,547,176 13,376,915 5,013,097 13,500,086	\$293, 498 207, 385 423, 720 158, 792 427, 622		\$293, 498 207, 385 423, 720 158, 792 427, 622	0.716% 0.506% 1.033% 0.387% 1.043%
	Arden Hills Austin Bemidji Blaine Bloomington	2, 300, 316 16, 717, 866 8, 889, 972 12, 234, 788 58, 327, 294		(725, 196) (626, 741) (679, 332) (1, 946, 793)	(80, 983) (625, 204) (152, 964) (300, 402) (3, 293, 940)		 2, 326, 375	148,479 71,141 832,491	 (66, 884)		(80, 983) (1, 350, 400) (631, 226) (908, 593) (2, 148, 751)	2,219,333 15,367,466 8,258,746 11,326,195 56,178,543	70,298 486,772 261,600 358,763 1,779,484		70,298 486,772 261,600 358,763 1,779,484	0.171% 1.187% 0.638% 0.875% 4.340%
	Brainerd Brooklyn Center Brooklyn Park Buffalo Burnsville	5,825,344 12,793,116 16,047,188 4,500,653 17,391,607	(4, 750, 054)	(510,631) (2,375,027) (77,934)	(28,210) (886,630)	320,000 60,000	 349,584	76, 100 6, 632 930, 706			(190,631) 136,100 (7,146,659) (77,934) 393,760	5,634,713 12,929,216 8,900,529 4,422,719 17,785,367	178,482 409,539 281,929 140,092 563,360	11,016	178, 482 409, 539 292, 945 140, 092 563, 360	0.435% 0.999% 0.714% 0.342% 1.374%
	Cambridge Champlin Chanhassen Chaska Chisholm	828,058 4,700,751 5,926,530 4,957,386 3,887,600		(165, 019) (241, 959)	(15, 512) (423, 126) (34, 914)			95, 544 65, 000 92, 467			0 80,032 (100,019) (572,618) (34,914)	828,058 4,780,783 5,826,511 4,384,768 3,852,686	26,229 151,434 184,558 138,890 122,036	3,888	26, 229 155, 322 184, 558 138, 890 122, 036	0.064% 0.379% 0.450% 0.339% 0.298%
	Cloquet Columbia Heights Coon Rapids Corcoran Cottage Grove	11,601,263 6,775,760 14,463,332 5,481,088 12,592,702		(595,848) (534,304) (589,688) (21,610)	(30,745) (23,711) (19,436) 	 1, 328, 248 (398, 814)		73,539 30,500 535,089 56,103	(197, 318)		(553,054) (724,833) 1,254,213 () (354,321)	11,048,209 6,050,927 15,717,545 5,481,088 12,238,381	349,958 191,666 497,861 173,616 387,657		349,958 191,666 497,861 173,616 387,657	0.854% 0.467% 1.214% 0.423% 0.946%
	Crookston Crystal Detroit Lakes Duluth Eagan	5, 436, 196 10, 124, 764 3, 984, 855 60, 564, 452 15, 087, 764		(930, 971)	(112,718)	2, 340, 000	1,054,200	1, 108, 538 3, 219, 277 175, 250 392, 508	(8,257) (462,853)	(537, 420)	1, 108, 538 1, 529, 911 0 202, 131 2, 732, 508	6,544,734 11,754,675 3,984,855 60,766,583 17,820,272	207, 308 372, 335 126, 222 1, 924, 812 564, 466	11,376 2,297	218,684 372,335 126,222 1,927,109 564,466	0, 533% 0, 908% 0, 308% 4, 700% 1, 377%
	East Bethel East Grand Forks Eden Prairie Edina Elk River	3, 207, 456 3, 175, 141 21, 375, 168 19, 797, 883 8, 508, 091		(1, 786, 141)	(33, 750) (155, 330) (968, 658)	75,000 461,663	974,299	17,200 121,700 45,296 8,000			17,200 162,950 1,280,632 (2,709,503) 8,000	3,224,656 3,338,091 22,655,800 17,088,380 8,516,091	102, 143 105, 736 717, 634 541, 283 269, 751		102, 143 105, 736 717, 634 541, 283 269, 751	0.249X 0.258X 1.750X 1.320X 0.658X
-	Fairmont Falcon Heights Faribault Farmington Fergus Falls	12, 507, 765 697, 794 10, 840, 213 6, 907, 169 7, 755, 045		(311,293)	(37, 712)	(27, 988)		23,732 2,346 7,133 67,200	(40, 902)	(529, 415) (195, 496) 	(505,683) (223,484) (346,659) 7,133 26,298	12,002,082 474,310 10,493,554 6,914,302 7,781,343	380, 172 15, 024 332, 389 219, 014 246, 478	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	380,172 15,024 332,389 219,014 246,478	0.927% 0.037% 0.811% 0.534% 0.601%
	Forest Lake Fridley Golden Valley Grand Rapids Ham Lake	2, 729, 075 9, 993, 316 14, 594, 420 4, 927, 278 3, 513, 410	(2,787,344)	(150, 366) (1, 393, 672) (789, 691) (167, 484) (423, 533)	(126, 999) (475, 482)	5,000	553,858	5,853 1,140,625 26,016			(150, 366) (4, 302, 162) (124, 548) 391, 374 (377, 517)	2,578,709 5,691,154 14,469,872 5,318,652 3,135,893	81,682 180,270 458,340 168,471 99,331		81,682 180,270 458,340 168,471 99,331	0.199X 0.440X 1.118X 0.411X 0.242X
	Hastings Hermantown Hibbing Hopkins Hutchinson	4,728,948 6,740,236 21,516,543 5,591,083 5,126,301		(495, 387) (12, 249) (459, 495)	(314, 963) (35, 039) (107, 535) (280, 706) (273, 473)	(252,687)	233, 038 570, 793	17,620 29,403 78,725	(182,219)	 (194,459)	(54, 305) (683, 242) (281, 497) (487, 414) (162, 175)	4,664,643 6,056,994 21,235,046 5,103,669 4,964,126	147,755 191,858 672,631 161,661 157,241	10, 94 1	147, 755 191, 858 683, 572 161, 661 157, 241	0.360% 0.468% 1.667% 0.394% 0.384%
	International Falls Inver Grove Heights Lake Elmo Lakeville Lino Lakes	4,954,447 8,382,288 2,785,891 20,078,222 7,029,237		(351,257) (65,787) (305,453) (592,470)	(148,165) (1,035,360)			617,797 99,556 64,950			(351,257) 403,845 (205,897) (1,035,360) (527,520)	4,603,190 8,786,133 2,579,994 19,042,862 6,501,717	145,808 278,305 81,723 603,192 205,945		145,808 278,305 81,723 603,192 205,945	0.356× 0.679× 0.199× 1.471× 0.502×
	Litchfield Little Canada Little Falls Mahtomedi Mankato	3,872,530 2,275,909 6,707,375 1,835,453 15,689,012		(333,525) (181,889) (124,230)	(175, 951) (745, 865)	291,783	<u></u>	43, 300 103, 166 424, 406			(509, 476) 335, 083 (78, 723) 0 (445, 689)	3, 363, 074 2, 610, 992 6, 628, 652 1, 835, 453 15, 243, 323	106,527 82,704 209,966 58,139 482,840	5, 328	106, 527 82, 704 209, 966 58, 139 488, 168	0.260% 0.202% 0.512% 0.142% 1.191%
	Maple Grove Maplewood Marshall Mendota Heights Minneapolis	20, 307, 104 9, 790, 502 3, 200, 238 4, 148, 620 167, 351, 274	(2,300,590)	(1, 150, 295) (286, 596) (475, 727) (11, 883, 739)	(896) (26, 978) (7, 716) (2, 815, 337)	(19,701) 45,000 (74,504) 140,000	1, 493, 191	311,626 58,320 8,970 6,652,348	(71,714)		291,029 (3,432,853) (302,780) (334,473) (6,625,251)	20, 598, 133 6, 357, 639 2, 897, 458 3, 814, 147 160, 726, 023	652,456 201,381 91,778 120,815 5,091,077	3,600	656,056 201,381 91,778 120,815 5,091,077	1.600% 0.491% 0.224% 0.295% 12.417%
	Minnetonka Montevideo Moorhead Morris Mound	26, 403, 632 2, 877, 440 12, 836, 431 2, 552, 543 3, 210, 029		(1,918,146) (255,776) (835,341) (304,488)	(3,270,785) (282,575) (187,741) (322,986)			282,150 101,305 15,476 107,446	(173, 190)		(4, 906, 781) (255, 776) (1, 189, 801) (172, 265) (520, 028)	21,496,851 2,621,664 11,646,630 2,380,278 2,690,001	680, 924 83, 043 368, 913 75, 396 85, 207		680, 924 83, 043 368, 913 75, 396 85, 207	1.661% 0.203% 0.900% 0.184% 0.208%
	Mounds View New Brighton New Hope New Ulm Northfield	2, 171, 160 6, 727, 206 8, 353, 150 7, 573, 989 6, 988, 329	(1, 129, 526)	(564, 763)	(260, 896) (1, 356, 912) (452, 481) (144, 326) (237, 837)			 8,850	(174,832)		(1, 955, 185) (1, 356, 912) (627, 313) (144, 326) (673, 610)	215,975 5,370,294 7,725,837 7,429,663 6,314,719	6,841 170,107 244,720 235,338 200,022		5,841 170,107 244,720 235,338 200,022	0.017% 0.415% 0.597% 0.574% 0.488%
	North Mankato North St. Paul Dakdale Orono Otsego	3,483,982 2,961,413 7,073,948 6,349,432 8,090,104	(1,247,108)	(209,677) (413) (623,554)	(22,792) (414,070) (190,000)	(220,000)		395, 146 24, 744 	(278,676)		(57, 323) (668, 415) 0 (2, 125, 915) 0	3, 426, 659 2, 292, 998 7, 073, 948 4, 223, 517 8, 090, 104	108, 541 72, 632 224, 071 133, 782 256, 258	 	108, 541 72, 632 224, 071 133, 782 256, 258	0.265× 0.177× 0.547× 0.326× 0.625×
	Owatonna Plymouth Prior Lake Ramsey Red Wing	11,454,865 21,319,570 6,093,606 8,142,793 12,897,781		(645, 091) (275, 340) (134, 078) (533, 288)	(793, 946) (37, 837)		 1,145,475	113, 638 103, 413 209, 125 187, 959 76, 176		(283,858)	(964, 166) (579, 515) (66, 215) 53, 881 688, 363	10,490,699 20,740,055 6,027,391 8,196,674 13,586,144	332,298 656,952 190,921 259,634 430,348		332, 298 656, 952 190, 921 259, 634 430, 348	0.810× 1.602× 0.466× 0.633× 1.050×
	Richfield Robbinsdale Rochester Rosemount Roseville	15,499,501 4,976,204 33,410,261 8,764,047 6,341,176	(250,140) 	(1,301,679) (682,468) (1,616,901) (704,697)	(66, 193) (73, 487) (43, 384) (46, 989)	 1,895,000	2,814,714	1,947,938 1,456,986 1,383,005	(170,511)		580,066 (1,006,095) (373,810) (46,989) 5,388,022	16,079,567 3,970,109 33,036,451 8,717,058 11,729,198	509, 328 125, 755 1, 046, 446 276, 117 371, 528		509, 328 125, 755 1, 046, 446 276, 117 371, 528	1.242X 0.307X 2.552X 0.673X 0.906X
	St. Anthony St. Cloud St. Louis Park St. Paul St. Peter	1,270,686 17,152,991 13,095,461 147,452,421 3,248,291	(11,779,041)	(234, 381) (249, 858) (503, 418) (12, 854, 567)	(184, 329) (167, 688) (1, 574, 125) (3, 696, 150) (102, 682)	1,841,945 141,719	1, 356, 666 320, 857	1, 149, 110 341, 626 2, 802, 635	(230, 500)		(418,710) 2,573,509 (379,251) (25,295,047) (102,682)	851, 976 19, 726, 500 12, 716, 210 122, 157, 374 3, 145, 609	26, 987 624, 847 402, 792 3, 869, 396 99, 639	16,272 	26,987 641,119 402,792 3,869,396 99,639	0.066% 1.564% 0.982% 9.438% 0.243%
	Sartell Sauk Rapids Savage Shakopee Shoreview	1,902,723 4,279,608 9,312,616 8,644,990 3,914,341		(315,769) (613,678) (371,802)	(81, 365) (106, 906) (155, 754)	327,703		9,834 			0 (387, 300) 327, 703 (720, 584) (527, 556)	1,902,723 3,892,308 9,640,319 7,924,406 3,386,785	60,270 123,291 305,362 251,010 107,278		60,270 123,291 305,362 251,010 107,278	0.147% 0.301% 0.745% 0.612% 0.262%
	Shorewood South St. Paul Spring Lake Park Stillwater Thief River Falls	5,603,047 7,532,748 1,773,899 7,311,537 7,208,359	(1,859,660)	(134, 199) (258, 921) (45, 814) (929, 830)	(2, 139) (7, 532) (843) (382, 862)	(38,893)		104,442 2,269	(11,288)		(134, 199) (272, 348) (92, 239) (2, 685, 891) (380, 593)	5,468,848 7,260,400 1,681,660 4,625,646 6,827,766	173, 229 229, 977 53, 267 146, 520 216, 273		173, 229 229, 977 53, 267 146, 520 216, 273	0.423x 0.561x 0.130x 0.357x 0.527x
	Vadnais Heights Virginia Waite Park Waseca West St. Paul	2, 175, 077 5, 578, 164 543, 183 1, 762, 068 4, 994, 026		(405, 932) (429, 250) (146, 083)	(38, 403)			5,000			(405, 932) (38, 403) (424, 250) (146, 083)	1,769,145 5,539,761 543,183 1,337,818 4,847,943	56,039 175,475 17,206 42,376 153,561	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	56,039 175,475 17,206 42,376 153,561	0.137% 0.428% 0.042% 0.103% 0.375%
	White Bear Lake Willmar Winona Woodbury Worthington	9, 552, 905 9, 125, 623 10, 192, 600 16, 709, 519 5, 662, 476	(1,030,707)	(714,296) (332,694) (1,064,813) (639,194)	(113,788) (360,973) (71,559) (56,959)	(19, 147)		279,823 22,500 340,950 80,054 26,842	(50,418)		(548, 261) (388, 891) 8, 256 (1, 075, 465) (1, 700, 018)	9,004,644 8,736,732 10,200,856 15,634,054 3,962,458	285, 227 276, 740 323, 117 495, 216 125, 513	27,648	285,227 304,388 323,117 495,216 125,513	0.696% 0.742% 0.788% 1.208% 0.306%
	STATE TOTAL	1,364,817,385	(\$27,134,170)	(\$63, 945, 255)	(\$30,506,743)	\$9,101,074	\$13, 438, 470	\$29,649,351	(\$2,219,742)	(\$1,740,648)	(\$73,357,663)\$	1,291,459,722	\$40,907,634	\$92,366	\$41,000,000	100.000%

Money Needs Apportionment = $\frac{$40,907,634}{$1,291,459,722}$

equals 0.0315755012 X Adj. 25 Yr. Const. Needs

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 succeeding 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.

,		(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E) (2xB)	(F) ***	(G)
	Balance	1991	Amount	*	(8	-C)	(Negative)	Estimated	Column B
•	As Of (-)	Construction	(=) Available	(-) Allowable	(=) Ex	cess	Adjustment Of	Loss Of 1992	Divided By
Municipality	09-01-91	Allotment	09-01-91	Balance	Bal	ance	Needs	Apportionment	Column A
Brooklyn Park	\$3,453,875	\$1,078,848	\$2,375,027	\$2,157,696	\$2	17,331	\$4,750,054	\$152,524	2.20
Fridley	1,952,505	558,833	1,393,672	1,117,666	2	76,006	2,787,344	89,502	2.49
Maplewood	[°] 1,662,967	512,672	1,150,295	1,025,344	1	24,951	2,300,590	73,872	2.24
Mounds View	753,188	188,425	564,763	500,000		64,763	1,129,526	36,269	3.00
Orono	823,540	199,986	623,554	500,000	1	23,554	1,247,108	40,045	3.12
Robbinsdale	1,019,686	337,218	682,468	674,436		8,032	1,364,936	8,032 **	2.02
St. Paul	19,092,738	6,238,171	12,854,567	12,476,342	3	78,225	25,709,134	378,225 **	2.06
Stillwater	1,279,535	349,705	929,830	699,410	2	30,420	1,859,660	59,714	2.66
Worthington	942,243	303,049	639,194	606,098		33,096	1,278,388	33,096 **	2.11
	\$30,980,277	\$9,766,907	\$21,213,370	\$19,756,992	\$1,4	56,378	\$42,426,740	\$871,278	1.99

* 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 needs = \$32.11

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

(A) (-) (B) (=) (C)

MUNICIPALITY	Amount Available 9-1-91	1991 Construction Allotment	UNENCUMBERED Construction Fund Balance Adjustment	Column (C) Divided By Column (B)
ELK RIVER Fairmont Falcon Heights	\$78,458 247,384 	\$346,706 537,198 92,894	 	0.00 0.00 0.00
Faribault Farmington Fergus Falls	725,144 248,820 365,589	413,851 263,361 396,636	311,293	$0.75 \\ 0.00 \\ 0.00$
Forest Lake Fridley Golden Valley	269,926 1,952,505 1,560,744	119,560 558,833 771,053	150,366 1,393,672 789,691	1.26 2.49 1.02
Grand Rapids Ham Lake Hastings	455,171 616,669 174,148	287,687 193,136 321,054	167,484 423,533 	0.58 2.19 0.00
Hermantown Hibbing Hopkins	609,885 372,560 396,839	114,498 743,800 384,590	495,387 12,249	4.33 0.00 0.03
HUTCHINSON International Falls Inver Grove Heights	734,487 603,643 448,166	274,992 252,386 382,379	459,495 351,257 65,787	1.67 1.39 0.17
Lake Elmo Lakeville Lino Lakes	426,860 171,516 891,191	121,407 727,348 298,721	305,453 592,470	2.52 0.00 1.98
LITCHFIELD LITTLE CANADA LITTLE FALLS	519,393 8,077 497,942	185,868 75,758 316,053	333,525 181,889	$1.79 \\ 0.00 \\ 0.58$
Mankato Maple Grove Maplewood	973,162 82,362 1,662,967	848,932 759,888 512,672	124,230 1,150,295	0.15 0.00 2.24
Marshall Mendota Heights Minneapolis	555,791 690,208 20,027,879	269,195 214,481 8,144,140	286,596 475,727 11,883,739	1.06 2.22 1.46
Minnetonka Montevideo Moorhead	3,083,393 429,149 1,621,584	1,165,247 173,373 786,243	1,918,146 255,776 835,341	1.65 1.48 / 1.06
Morris Mound Mounds View	496,448 753,188	149,579 191,960 188,425	304,488 564,763	0.00 1.59 3.00
New Brighton New Hope New Ulm	23,263 173,932	391,624 449,329 373,303		$ \begin{array}{c} 0.00 \\ 0.00 \\ 0.00 \end{array} $

(A) (-) (B) (=) (C)

MUNICIPALITY	Amount Available 9-1-91	1991 Construction Allotment	UNENCUMBERED Construction Fund Balance Adjustment	Column (Ĉ) 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 Orono Otsego	823,540 344,397	276,761 199,986 344,398	623,554	0.00 3.12 0.00
Owatonna Plymouth Prior Lake	115,632 1,610,330 600,555	593,673 965,239 325,215	645,091 275,340	0.00 0.67 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. Louis 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 Savage Shakopee	514,709 988,852	198,940 275,950 375,174	315,769 613,678	$1.59 \\ 0.00 \\ 1.64$
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	135,248	89,434	45,814	0.51
Stillwater	1,279,535	349,705	929,830	2.66
Thief River Falls	169,570	343,286		0.00
Vadnais Heights Virginia Waseca	537,792 31,970 594,136	131,860 254,251 164,886	405,932 429,250	3.08 0.00 2.60
West St. Paul	563,040	416,957	146,083	$0.35 \\ 1.61 \\ 0.00$
White Bear Lake	1,159,134	444,838	714,296	
Willmar		408,666		
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	PROJECT Amount	TOTAL Money Needs Adjustment
ALBERT LEA	101-010-02	\$160	\$160
Austin	104-010-04 104-020-08	1,253 8,545 9,798	9,798
BLAINE	106-020-02 106-010-12 106-010-13	67,224 15,925 901	
		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	473,650 399,217	
		872,867	872,867
Chaska	196-010-08 196-010-03	15,418 8,795	
		24,213	24,213
Columbia Heights	113-010-03	23,711	23,711
CRYSTAL	116-020-02	81,584	81,584
Duluth	118-010-18 118-020-13	81,475 45,125	
		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	132-010-02 132-020-05 132-020-07	1,487 13,234 33,793	
		48,514	48,514

MUNICIPALITY	PROJECT	PROJECT Amount	TOTAL MONEY NEEDS Adjustment
INVER GROVE HEIGHTS	178-020-08	\$38,313	\$38,313
LITCHFIELD	135-010-18	23,442	23,442
MINNEAPOLIS	141-010-18 141-010-27 141-010-28 141-010-29 141-020-16 141-020-26	20,406 90,201 85,267 74,061 79,351 99,355	448 641
Moorhead	144-010-03 144-010-04 144-010-07	51,942 4,344 144,964 201,250	201,250
New Brighton	147-020-10 147-020-11 147-020-12 147-020-14 147-020-16	44,037 75,961 175,519 322,629 83,744	
		701,890	701,890
New Hope	182-020-12	248,981	248,981
North St Paul	151-020-07	198,833	198,833
St. Louis Park	163-010-19	133,676	133,676
St. Paul	164-020-62	147,284	147,284
St. Peter	165-010-04	91,853	91,853
SHOREVIEW	167-020-02 167-020-04	25,676 7,403	22.070
WHITE BEAR LAKE	174-020-09 174-020-10	33,079 16,894 20,512	33,079
		37,406	37,406
WILLMAR	175-020-04 175-020-06 175-020-07	371 79,392 43,461	
		123,224	123,224

TOTAL

ð

\$4,666,350

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

MUNICIPALITY	1990 Expen- Ditures	(+)	1980 - 1989 EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENT	(-)	EXPIRED ADJUSTMENT =	APPORTION- MENT ADJUSTMENT
ALBERT LEA	\$160		\$279,803			\$279,963
ALEXANDRIA			161,571			161,571
ANDOVER			113,955			113,955
ANOKA			106,096		(\$53,713)	<u>52,383</u>
APPLE VALLEY			230,701			230,701
ARDEN HILLS	0-700		80, 383		(50.001)	80,983
AUSTIN	9,/98		0/5,30/		(23,301)	023,204
BEMIDJI	94 050		152,904		(33 027)	152,504
	24,050		3 838 150		(568' 424)	3 203 040
BDATNERD	24,303		40,806		(40, 806)	57257540
BRAINERD REALINERD			40,000		(40/000/	
ROOKLYN PARK	15.054		13,156			28,210
BUFFALO						
BURNSVILLE	872.867		13.763			886,630
CHAMPLIN			15,512			15,512
CHANHASSEN						
Chaska	24,213		398,913			423,126
CHISHOLM			34,914			34,914
CLOQUET			30,745			30,745
COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	23,711		10 100			23, /11
COON RAPIDS			19,430			19,436
LORCORAN						
COTTAGE GROVE						
	<u>81 58/</u>		31 134			112 718
DETPOTT LAKES	01,504		31,134			IIC;/IQ
DII IITU	126,600		437.866			564.466
FAGAN	120,000					
FAST BETHEL						
FAST GRAND FORKS	33.750					33,750
EDEN PRAIRIE			155,330			155,330
Edina	430,152		645,157		(106,651)	968,658
ELK RIVER					•	
FAIRMONT						
Falcon Heights			40 750		(2 041)	17 74 8
FARIBAULT			40,/53		(3,041)	3/,/12
FARMINGTON			120 625		(120 625)	
FERGUS FALLS			120,033		(120,035)	
FUREST LAKE	17 810		100 180			126 999
GOLDEN VALLEY	347'481		128,001			475,482
GRAND RAPTDS			10/001			
HAM LAKE		I				
HASTINGS	63,381		251,582			314,963
HERMANTOWN	35,039		••			35,039
HIBBING			107,535			107,535
HOPKINS	48,514		232,192			<u>280,706</u>
HUTCHINSON _			273,473			273,473
INTERNATIONAL FALLS						 140 1/P
INVER_GROVE HEIGHTS	38,313		109,852			148,165
LAKE ELMO			1 1 7 2 2 4			1 025 260
			T,032,300			T'022'200
LINU LAKES						

MUNICIPALITY	1990 EXPEN- DITURES (+)	1980 - 1989 EXPENDITURE ADJUSTMENT	EXPIRED (-) ADJUSTMENT =	1992 APPORTION- MENT ADJUSTMENT
LITCHFIELD	\$23,442	\$152,509		\$175,951
LITTLE CANADA				
LITTLE FALLS Mankato		745.865		745.865
MAPLE GROVE		896		896
MAPLEWOOD	63 m	26, <u>978</u>	(#11 775)	26,978
MARSHALL Mendota Hetchts		11,//S 7 716	(\$11,//5)	7 716
MINNEAPOLIS	448,641	2,366,696		2,815,337
MINNETONKA		3,447,811	(177,026)	3,270,785
MONTEVIDO	201 250	81 325		282 575
MORRIS		187,741		187,741
MOUND		322,986		322,986
MOUNDS VIEW	701 900	260,896	(503 306)	260,896
NEW DRIGHION NEW HOPE	248,981	259,468	(55,968)	452.481
NEW ULM		144, 326		144, 326
NORTHFIELD		237,837		237,837
NORTH MANKATO	198.833	215,237		414,070
OAKDALE	*			
Orono		191,624	(1, 624)	190,000
		355, 390 37, 837	(101,444)	793,940
PRIOR LAKE				577037
RAMSEY				
RED WING		60 351	(3 161)	66 103
ROBBINSDALE	·	73,487	(3,101)	73,487
ROCHESTER		43, 384		43,384
ROSEMOUNT		46,989		46,989
ST. ANTHONY		223.789	(39,460)	184,329
ST. CLOUD		317,406	(149,718)	167,688
ST. LOUIS PARK	133,6/6	1,440,449	(85 566)	1,5/4,125
ST. PETER	91,853	10.829	(03,300)	102,682
SAUK RAPIDS		135,926	(54,561)	81,365
SAVAGE		106 006		106 006
SHAKOPEE Shorevtew	33.079	122.675		155.754
SHOREWOOD _				
SOUTH ST. PAUL		2,139		2,139
SPRING LAKE PARK		843		843
THIEF RIVER FALLS		418,993	(36,131)	382,862
VADNAIS HEIGHTS		20 402		20 102
VIRGINIA Waseca		30,403		30,403
West St. Paul	3 ¹			
WHITE BEAR LAKE	37,406	76,382	(153 079)	113,788
WILLMAR	123,224	291,/21	(153,9/2)	300,9/3
WOODBURY		71,559		71,559
WORTHINGTON		56,959		56,959
TOTAL	\$4,666,350	\$28,269,373	(\$2,428,980)	\$30,506,743

Unamortized Bond Account Balance

(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.

			Unamortized	Total Disbursements	Unencumbered	Off System	Bond
	Date of	Amount of	Bond	and Obligations	Bond Balance	Disburse-	Account
Municipality Issue		Issue	Balance	to December 31, 1990	Available	ment	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 Disburse- ment	Bond Account 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. Paul	**	**	**	**	**	**	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."

MUNICIPALITY	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

* REHABILITATION OF THE LIFT BRIDGE WHICH WAS APPROVED BY THE SCREENING BOARD IN 1986.

		PROJECT	TOTAL
MUNICIPALITI	PRUJECT 	AMOUNT	ADJUSTMENT
Andover	198-114-02 198-115-02	\$18,905	
	198-117-01	7,111	
		147,283	\$147,283
Blaine	106-101-04	71,141	71,141
Drecklar Conton	100 104 01	((00))	·
Brooklyn Center	109-104-01	(7,825)	
	109-106-02	(250)	
	109-111-13	60,900	
		52,225	52,225
Burnsville	179-123-01	369,759	
	179-123	41,300	
		411,059	411,059
Chanhassen	194-110-01	65,000	65,000
Chaska	196-110-01	9,901	9,901
Cottage Grove	180-102-10	54.184	
	180-103-01	11,919	
		66,103	66,103
East Bethel	203-101-03	2,000	2,000
Nam Lako	107-114-01	7 111	
nam Lake	197-114-01	18,905	
	1), 11, 02		
		26,016	26,016
Mankato	137-122-01	42,305	42,305
Maple Grove	189-101	14,810	
	189-106	9,243	
	189-109	75,027	
	189-125	42.275	
		261,588	261,588
Ramsey	199-110-03	30,491	
	199-112-02	60,482	
		90,973	90,973
Rochester	159-114-09	130,645	130,645
St. Cloud	162-108-13	363,287	363,287
St. Louis Park	163-275-07	866	
	163-276-25	440	
		1,306	1,306
St. Paul	164-125-21	282,578	282,578
Total			\$2,023,410

PROJECT LISTING OF RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION IN 1990

NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION

(For reference, see Right-of-Way Resolution)

MUNICIPALITY	1979-1989 EXPENDITURES TOTAL NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR 1991 APPORT.	(+)	1990 EXPENDI- TURES	(=)	TOTAL RIGHT-OF-AWAY ADJUSTMENT FOR 1992 APPORTIONMENT
Albert Lea					
ALEXANDRIA			 ¢1/7 202		¢1/7 202
	\$28 974		\$147,20J 		28 974
APPLE VALLEY	<i><i>vL</i>0;<i>J</i>7<i>4</i></i>				
ARDEN HILLS					
AUSTIN					
Bemidji	148,479				148,479
BLAINE	022 401		/1,141		/1,141
BRAINERD	032,491				032,491
BROOKLYN CENTER	23.875		52.225		76.100
BROOKLYN PARK	-6,632				6,632
BUFFALO					
BURNSVILLE	519,647		411,059		930,706
	95,544		65 000		95,544
CHANHASSEN	82 566		9,000		92'467
					52,407
CLOQUET	73,539				73,539
COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	_30,500				_30,500
COON RAPIDS	535,089				535,089
CORCORAN			66 102		<u> </u>
CONTAGE GROVE	1 108 538		00,103		1 108 538
CRUCKSTON	3,219,277				3,219,277
DETROIT LAKES					
DULUTH	175,250				175,250
EAGAN	392,508		000		392,508
LAST BETHEL	15,200		2,000		121,200
EAST GRAND FORKS	121,700				121,700
FOTNA	45,296				45.296
ELK RIVER	8,000				8,000
FAIRMONT	23,732				23,732
FALCON HEIGHTS					
FARIBAULT	2,340				2,340
FERCUS FALLS	67 200				67 200
FOREST LAKE					
FRIDLEY	5,853				5,853
GOLDEN_VALLEY	1,140,625				1,140,625
GRAND RAPIDS	 ,		26 016		26 016
	17 620		20,010		20,010
HEDMANTOWN	29'403				29'403
HIBBING	78.725				78.725
HOPKINS					
HUTCHINSON _					
INTERNATIONAL FALLS	 617 707				 617 709
INVER GROVE MEIGHTS	01/,/9/		• •		00,25%
LARE ELMU					
LINO LAKES	64.950				64.950
LITCHFIELD					

MUNICIPALITY	1979-1989 EXPENDITURES TOTAL NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR 1991 APPORT.	(+)	1990 EXPENDI- TURES	(=)	TOTAL RIGHT-OF-AWAY ADJUSTMENT FOR 1992 APPORTIONMENT
LITTLE CANADA	\$43,300				\$43,300
LITTLE FALLS	103,166		¢ 12 205		103,166
MANKATU Marie Grove	50, 101		342,305 261 588		424,400
MAPLEWOOD	50,050				511,020
MARSHALL	58, <u>320</u>				58,3 <u>2</u> 0
MENDOTA HEIGHTS	8,970				8,970
MINNEAPOLIS	0,052,348				0,052,348
MONTEVIDEO	202,150				202,150
MOORHEAD	101,305				101,305
MORRIS	15,476				15,476
MOUND	107,446				107,446
MOUNDS VIEW New Brighton					
New Hope					
NEW ULM					
NORTHFIELD	8,850				8,850
NORTH MANKATO	395,140 24,744				395,140
NORTH SI. FAUL	24,744				24,/44
ORONO					
QWATONNA	113,638				113,638
PLYMOUTH	103, 413		-		103,413
PRIOR LAKE	209,125		00 073		209,125
RED WING	76.176		JU, J/ J 		76.176
RICHFIELD	1,947,938				1,947,938
ROBBINSDALE	1 206 241		120 645		
ROCHESTER	1,326,341		130,045		1,450,980
ROSEVILLE	1.383.005				$1.38\overline{3.005}$
ST. ANTHONY					
ST. CLOUD	785,823		363,287		1,149,110
ST. LOUIS PARK	340,320		1,300		341,626
ST. PAUL St. Peter	2,520,057		202,370		2,002,033
SAUK RAPIDS	9,834				9,834
SAVAGE					
SHAKOPEE					
SHOREVIEW					
SOUTH ST. PAUL					
SPRING LAKE PARK					
STILLWATER	104,442				104,442
IHIEF RIVER FALLS	2,269				2,269
VADNAIS REIGHIS VIDGINIA					
WASECA	5,000				5,000
WEST ST. PAUL					
WHITE BEAR LAKE	279,823				279,823
WILLMAK Winona	22,500				22,300
WOODBURY	80.054				80.054
WORTHINGTON	ŽĞ, 842				ŽĞ, ŠŽ
TOTAL	\$27,625,941		\$2,023,410		\$29,649,351

•

•

1990 CONSTRUCTION ACCOMPLISHMENTS BITUMINOUS OVERLAY CONCRETE JOINT REPAIR

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	PROJECT Number	MONEY NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED IN 1990
ANOKA	BIT OVERLAY	103-125-06	\$14,214
BLOOMINGTON	BIT OVERLAY BIT OVERLAY BIT OVERLAY BIT OVERLAY	107-132-15 107-384-03 107-420-07 107-439-01	18,790 18,738 21,456 7,900 66,884
COLUMBIA HEIGHTS	BIT OVERLAY BIT OVERLAY	113-105-02 113-104-07	16,156 34,801 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	Ŷ		\$910,198
TOTAL NEEDS ADJUSTMENT FOR 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	1989 EXPENDITURES +	1990 EXPENDITURES	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

VARIANCE ADJUSTMENTS

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 REQUIRE 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 (36th 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 Surface 117		6,81 7,10	.6 9	W V	idth re ariance	equired e width	52 ' <u>48'</u>		
4000 00F			\$22	3,92	5	A	djustme	ent width	4'
\$223,925	Х	<u>4'</u> 52'	х	15	=	\$537,420	neeas	adjustme	nt.

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(Received Needs for 72')Base\$197,308Width required 62'Surface $\frac{172,400}{$364,708}$ Variance width $\frac{56'}{61}$ \$364,708X $\frac{6'}{62'}$ X 15 = \$529,415needs 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') (Received Needs for 40')

Segment	040				Segme	nt 05	<u>50</u>	Width required	40' 34'
Base \$21,264 surface <u>15,463</u>			\$28,456 <u>20,704</u>			Adjustment width	<u>54</u> 6'		
	\$37 ,	727		+	\$49,1	60	=	\$86,887	
\$86,887	X <u>6'</u> 40'	Х	15	=	\$195,496	need	ls	adjustment.	

<u>Hopkins</u> (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 5th 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')						(Received Needs for 52')			
<u>Segment 0</u>	10					<u>Segment 0</u>	20	Width required 48' Variance width <u>46'</u>	
Base Surface		\$64 56	,216 ,090			\$101,845 <u>88,984</u>		Adjustment width 2'	
		\$120	,306	+		\$190,829	=	\$311,135	
\$311,135	x	<u>2'</u> 48'	x	15	=	\$194,459	need	s adjustment.	

 $\underline{Owatonna}$ (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' on segment 020, 030, 040) (Received Needs for 52' for segment 050)

Segment 020 050 030 <u>040</u> \$55,061 \$34,414 \$12,055 \$16,080 Base 13,560 Surface 62,006 38,771 14,063 \$117,067 + \$73,185 + \$25,615 + \$30,143 = \$246,010Width Required 52' Variance Width <u>48</u> Adjustment Width \$246,010 X <u>4'</u> X 15 = \$283,858 needs adjustment. 52

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.

<u>Morris</u> (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 8th Street instead of the required minimum of 30 miles per hour.

<u>Mound</u> (90-12)

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.

<u>Red Wing</u> (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.

<u>Red Winq</u> (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.

<u>Red Wing</u> (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.

<u>Red Winq</u> (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.

<u>Stillwater</u> (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)

<u>Columbia Heights</u> (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.

<u>Mankato</u> (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.

<u>Minneapolis</u> (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.

<u>Minneapolis</u> (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.

<u>Minneapolis</u> (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.

<u>New Ulm</u> (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.

<u>St. Paul</u> (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.

<u>St. Paul</u> (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.

<u>St. Paul</u> (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 4th 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

<u>Duluth</u> (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 1st Street to Grand Avenue.

<u>St. Paul</u> (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 4:00-6:00 p.m. on the west side and with parking banned between 7:00-9:00 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.)

MSAS Route No.	Date of Release	Total Mileage	Plan Approve	Miles Const.	Miles Eligible Maint.	Date of MSAS Desig.	199 Maintenance Miles X	Allowance \$7,200
Brooklyn Par	k							
137 (TH 169)	10-88	1.53	No	0.00	1.53	11-88	1.53 x \$7,200	= \$11,016
Champlin								
114 (TH 169)	10-88	0.54	No	0.00	0.54	11-88	.54 x \$7,200	= \$3,888
Crookston								
115 (TH 75)	11-87	0.30	No	0.00	0.30	03-88	.30 x \$7,200	= \$2,160
144 (my 75)	11-87	1.28	No	0.00	1.28	03-88	1.28 x \$7,200	= \$9,216
(IN 75)		1.58			1.58			\$11,376
Duluth								
107 & 108 (TH 2)	6-91	0.55	No	0.00	0.55	08-91	.55 x \$7,200 X	.58 = \$2,297
Hibbing								
175 & 226 (TH 73)	6-91	2.62	No	0.00	2.62	07-91	2.62 x \$7,200 :	K .58 = \$10,941

MSAS	Date				Miles	Date of	19	91
Route No.	of Release	Total Mileage	Plan Approve	Miles Const.	Eligible Maint.	MSAS Desig.	Maintenance Miles X	Allowance \$7,200
Mankato								
101 (TH 22)	4-85	1.10	No Yes	0.24 0.86	0.24	06-85	.24 x \$7,200	= \$1,728
124 (TH 22)		0.50	No	0.00	0.50	01-90	.50 x \$7,200	= \$3,600
(111 22)		1.60			0.74			\$5,328
Maple Grove								
128 (TH 169)	10-88	0.50	No	0.00	0.50	11-88	.50 x \$7,200	= \$3,600
St. Cloud								
115,131,145 (TH 15)	10-90	2.26	No	0.00	2.26	12-90	2.26 x \$7,200	= \$16,272
Willmar								
153 (TH 23 & 71)	10-85	3.22	No	0.00	3.22	01-86	3.22 x \$7,200	= \$23,184
153 (mu21)	10-85	0.62	No	0.00	0.62	03-90	.62 x \$7,200	= \$4,464
(TH/L)		3.84			3.84			\$27,648
TOTAL		15.02		0.86	 14.16			\$92,366

.

``

.

THEORETICAL 1992 M.S.A.S. TOTAL APPORTIONMENT

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 Apportion- ment	Money Needs Apportion- ment	TOTAL Apportion- ment	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%
Bemidji	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	276,645	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 Apportion- ment	Money Needs Apportion- ment	TOTAL Apportion- Ment	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 Apportion- ment	MONEY NEEDS Apportion- Ment	IOTAL Apportion- Ment	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%
WILLMAR	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%

COMPARISON OF THE 1991 TO 1992 APPORTIONMENT

, **,**

MUNICIPALITY	1991 Total Allotment	Estimated 1992 Total Allotment	INCREASE (Decrease) Amount	% 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	0	100,752	0	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	12,778	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%

1

MUNICIPALITY	1991 TOTAL Allotment	ESTIMATED 1992 Total Allotment	Increase (Decrease) Amount	% 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	2.96%
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%
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 (Decrease) Amount	% 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%
St. Cloud	1,249,122	1,355,217	106,095	8.49%
St. Louis 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%
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%
WILLMAR	544,888	560,859	15,971	2.93%
Winona	669,640	694,693	25,053	3.74%
Woodbury	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)	(D)	(E)	(A-E)
			Amount	1.125		
	Balance	1991	Available	Times (A)	1994	
	As Of (<pre>-) Construction (=)</pre>	Without Last	Construction	Allowable	(=) Excess
Municipality	09-01-91	Allotment	Const. Allot.	Allotment	Amount	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)

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(A-E)
			Amount	1.125		
	Balance	1991	Available	Times (A)	1994	
	As Of (-) Construction (=)	Without Last	Construction	Allowable	(=) Excess
Municipality	09-01-91	Allotment	Const. Allot.	Allotment	Amount	Balance
Faribault	\$725,144	\$413,851	\$311,293	\$465,582	\$500,000	\$225,144
Farmington	248,820	263,361	(14,541)	296,281	500,000	(251,180)
Fergus Falls	365,589	396,636	(31,047)	446,216	500,000	(134,411)
Forest Lake	269,926	119,560	150,366	134,505	500,000	(230,074)
Fridley	1,952,505	558,833	1,393,672	628,687	628,687	1,323,818
Golden Valley	1,560,744	771,053	789,691	867,435	867,435	693,309
Grand Rapids	455,171	287,687	167,484	323,648	500,000	(44,829)
Ham Lake	616,669	193, 136	423,533	217,278	500,000	116,669
Hastings	174,148	321,054	(146,906)	361,186	500,000	(325,852)
Hermantown	609,885	114,498	495,387	128,810	500,000	109,885
Hibbing	372,560	743,800	(371,240)	836,775	836,775	(464,215)
Hopkins	396,839	384,590	12,249	432,664	500,000	(103,161)
Hutchinson	734,487	274,992	459,495	309,366	500,000	234,487
International Falls	603,643	252,386	351,257	283,934	500,000	103,643
Inver Grove Heights	448,166	382,379	65,787	430,176	500,000	(51,834)
Lake Elmo	426,860	121,407	305,453	136,583	500,000	(73,140)
Lakeville	171,516	727,348	(555,832)	818,267	818,267	(646,751)
Lino Lakes	891,191	298,721	592,470	336,061	500,000	391, 191
Litchfield	519,393	185,868	333,525	209,102	500,000	19,393
Little Canada	8,077	75,758	(67,681)	85,228	500,000	(491,923)
`Little Falls	497,942	316,053	181,889	355,560	500,000	(2,058)
Mankato	973,162	848,932	124,230	955,049	955,049	18,114
Maple Grove	82,362	759,888	(677,526)	854,874	854,874	(772,512)
Maplewood	1,662,967	512,672	1,150,295	576,756	576,756	1,086,211
Marshall	555,791	269,195	286,596	302,844	500,000	55,791
Mendota Heights	690,208	214,481	475,727	241,291	500,000	190,208
Minneapolis	20,027,879	8,144,140	11,883,739	9,162,158	9,162,158	10,865,722
Minnetonka	3,083,393	1,165,247	1,918,146	1,310,903	1,310,903	1,772,490
Montevideo	429,149	173,373	255,776	195,045	500,000	(70,851)
Moorhead	1,621,584	786,243	835,341	884,523	884,523	737,061
Morris		149,579	(149,579)	168,276	500,000	(500,000)
Mound	496,448	191,960	304,488	215,955	500,000	(3,552)
Mounds View	753,188	188,425	564,763	211,978	500,000	253,188
New Brighton	23,263	391,624	(368,361)	440,577	500,000	(476,737)
New Hope		449,329	(449,329)	505,495	505,495	(505,495)
New Ulm	173,932	373,303	(199,371)	419,966	500,000	(326,068)
Northfield	818, 197	373,574	444,623	420,271	500,000	318, 197
North Mankato	443,665	233,988	209,677	263,237	500,000	(56,335)
North St. Paul	260,695	260,282	413	292,817	500,000	(239,305)

· •

	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(A-E)
		4004	Amount	1.125	100/	
	Balance	1991	Available	Times (A)	1994	
M 7 . 7 1 7 A	AS 01 (-) Construction (=)	Without Last	Construction	Allowable	(=) Excess
Municipality	09-01-91	Allotment	Const. Allot.	Allotment	Amount	Balance
Oakdale		\$276,761	(\$276,761)	\$311,356	\$500,000	(\$500,000)
Orono	\$823,540	199,986	623,554	224,984	500,000	323,540
Otsego	344,397	344,398	(1)	387,448	500,000	(155,603)
Owatonna	115,632	593,673	(478,041)	667,882	667,882	(552,250)
Plymouth	1,610,330	965,239	645,091	1,085,894	1,085,894	524,436
Prior Lake	600,555	325,215	275,340	365,867	500,000	100,555
Ramsey	551.516	417,438	134.078	469.618	500.000	51,516
Red Wing	1.017.545	484,257	533,288	544,789	544,789	472,756
Richfield	2,028,566	726,887	1,301,679	817,748	817,748	1,210,818
Robbinsdale	1.019.686	337,218	682.468	379.370	500.000	519,686
Rochester	3,434,036	1.817.135	1.616.901	2.044.277	2.044.277	1.389.759
Rosemount		305,704	(305,704)	343,917	500,000	(500,000)
Roseville	1.483.800	779,103	704 . 697	876,491	876,491	607.309
St. Anthony	374.278	139,897	234.381	157.384	500,000	(125,722)
St. Cloud	1,176,980	927, 122	249,858	1,043,012	1,043,012	133,968
St. Louis Park	1.202.500	823.035	379.465	925.914	925.914	276,586
St. Paul	19.092.738	6.238,171	12.854.567	7.017.942	7.017.942	12.074.796
St. Peter	226,642	226,641	1	254,971	500,000	(273,358)
Sauk Rapids	514.709	198,940	315,769	223.808	500.000	14,709
Savage		275,950	(275,950)	310,444	500,000	(500,000)
Shakopee	988,852	375,174	613,678	422,071	500,000	488,852
Shoreview	739.744	367,942	, 371,802	413,935	500.000	239 744
Shorewood	385,594	251,395	134,199	282.819	500,000	(114,406)
South St. Paul	690,661	431,740	258,921	485,708	500,000	190,661
Spring Lake Park	135 248	80 434	45 814	100 613	500 000	(364 752)
Stillwater	1.279.535	349,705	929 830	393 418	500,000	779 535
Thief River Falls	169,570	343,286	(173,716)	386,197	500,000	(330,430)
Vadnais Heights	537 792	131 860	405 932	148 343	500 000	37 792
Virginia	31 970	254 251	(222, 281)	286 032	500,000	(468,030)
Waseca	594,136	164,886	429,250	185,497	500,000	94,136
West St. Paul	563.040	416.957	146.083	469.077	500.000	63,040
White Bear Lake	1,159,134	444,838	714.296	500.443	500.443	658.691
Willmar		408,666	(408,666)	459,749	500,000	(500,000)
Winona	834 . 924	502-230	332.694	565.009	565.009	269,915
Woodburv	1.860.880	796.067	1.064.813	895.575	895.575	965.305
Worthington	942,243	303,049	639,194	340,930	500,000	442,243
	\$120,663,647	\$66,502,556	\$54,161,091	\$74,815,376	\$88,726,223	\$31,937,424

. .

* The allowable balance in (E) is 1.125 times the construction allotment or \$500,000 (whichever is greater.)

Research Account Motion

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
ه ه ب ن ه نه نه ک و چ چ ه م ه ه

Year	Allotment	Balance	Spent
1059		¢ 0	
1958	Ş U	Ş U	Ş U
1929	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
19,65	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	65.966
1988	132.754	72,201	60 552
1989	145 952	42,270	102 574
1000	101 254	40 960	150 204
1001	171/237 202 702	30,700	130,294
エププエ	2031133		

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 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 OF THE MUNICIPAL SCREENING BOARD

JUNE 1991

BE IT RESOLVED:

ADMINISTRATION

Appointments to Screening Board - Oct. 1961 (Revised June 1981)

That annually the Commissioner of Mn/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. Construction Cut Off Date - Oct. 1962 (Revised 1967)

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.

St. Paul

MSA ROUT <u>NO.</u>	E		<u>TERM</u>	INI		А	PPROVA <u>DATE</u>	L <u>MI</u>	LEAG	E	NEE <u>WIE</u>	EDS DTH
134 198	EB Fifth WB Sixt	i St. ih St.	- Fort in to Br	Rd. (coadw	W. 7th St.) vay St.		6/89	0.85 0.86	Miles Miles	5	28' & 36	; 36'
235 236	NB Wat SB St. P	oasha St. Peter St.	- Kello to Ty	ogg B welfth	lvd. 1 St.		6/89	0.61 0.62	Miles Miles	5	36 36	, ,
165 117	NB Min SB Ceda	nesota St. ar St.	- Kello to Te	ogg B enth S	lvd. St.		6/89	0.47 0.46	Miles Miles	5	36 36	, ,
196	NB Sible SB Jacks	ey St. son St.	- Shepa to Se	ard R venth	oad 1 St.		6/89	0.34 <u>CSA</u> 4.21	Miles H Miles	5 	36	,
<u>COST</u>		200 20										,
<u>Co</u>	onstructio	n Item Unit	Prices -	(Rev	rised Annua	lly)						
	Right of	Way (Needs	s only)	\$ 60	,000.00 Ac	re						
	Grading	(Excavation))				S	5	3.00	Cu. Y	ľd.	
	Base:											
		Class 4		Spec	. #2211		3	5	4.75	Ton		
		Class 5		Spec	. #2211				6.00	Ton		
		Bituminous		Spec	. #2331				20.00	Ton		
	Surface:											
	0	Bituminous		Spec	. #2331		9	5	20.00	Ton		
		Bituminous		Spec	. #2341				23.50	Ton		
		Bituminous		Spec	. #2361				30.00	Ton		
	Shoulder	rc.										
	Shouldo	Gravel		Spec	. #2221		5	5	7.00	Ton		
	Miscella	neous:										
		Storm Sewe	r Consti	ructio	n		\$	196,0	00.00	Mile		
		Storm Sewe	r Adjusi	tment	•			62,0	00.00	Mile		
		Special Drai	nage-Ri	ural				25,0	00.00	Mile		
		Traffic Sign	als				18,750 to	75,0	00.00	Mile		
Signal	Needs B	ased On Pro	iected T	'raffic	1							
Project	ted Traffi	c Pe	ercentag	e X	Unit Price	=			Nee	ds Pe	r Mil	e
0 -	- 4,999		.25		\$75,000	=	\$	5 18.7	50.00	Mile	· · _ · _ · _ · 	-
5,000	- 9,999		.50		75,000	=	•	37.5	00.00	Mile		
10,000	& Over		1.00		75,000	=		75,0	00.00	Mile		

Street Lighting Curb & Gutter Sidewalk Engineering

Curb & Gutter

Tree Removal

Concrete Pavement

Sidewalk

16,000.00 Mile 5.50 Lin. Ft. 14.00 Sq. Yd. 18%

\$ 1.60 Lin. Ft.
4.00 Sq. Yd.
4.00 Sq. Yd.
140.00 Unit

STRUCTURES

Removal Items:

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 Sq. Ft.
Bridges 150 to 499 Ft.	60.00 Sq. Ft.
Bridges 500 & Over	65.00 Sq. Ft.
Bridge Widening	150.00 Sq. 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) Signals and Gates(Multiple Track - high Signs Only & low speed) Rubberized Railroad Crossings (Per Track) \$ 80,000 Unit \$110,000 Unit \$ 500 Unit \$ 850 Lin. 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 Under 1000 Vehicles Per Day	Cost For Over 1000 Vehicles Per Day
Traffic Lanes:	\$1.200	\$2,000
Segment length times number of traffic lanes times cost per mile.	(Per Mile)	(Per Mile)
Parking Lanes:	\$1,200	\$1,200
Segment length times number of parking lanes times cost per mile.	(Per Mile)	(Per Mile)
Median Strip:	\$ 400	\$ 800
Segment length times cost per mile.	(Per Mile)	(Per Mile)
Storm Sewer:	\$ 400	\$ 400
Segment length times cost per mile.	(Per Mile)	(Per Mile)
Traffic Signals:	\$ 400	\$ 400
Number of traffic signals times cost for each signal.	(Per Each)	(Per Each)
Unlimited Segments: Normal M.S.A.S. Streets.		
Minimum allowance for mile is determined by segment length times cost per mile.	\$4,000 (Per Mile)	\$4,000 (Per Mile)

- ----

Limited Segments: Combination Routes.

Minimum allowance for mile is determined	\$2,000	\$2,000
by segment length times cost per mile.	(Per Mile)	(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.

<u>Variance Granted - Reduction of Money Needs</u> - 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.

<u>Traffic Counting</u> - 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.