Albert Lea, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Blazing Star Landing	1	GO	$ 3,500	$ 11,500	$ 0
Stables Sanitary Sewer and Water Extension	2	GO	$ 1,350	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,850	$ 11,500	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,850	$ 11,500	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Blazing Star Landing

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$15 million is being requested to provide redevelopment and renewal of the former Farmland Foods site deriving from a plant fire and plant closing in 2001 that resulted in a severe economic blow to the community through the loss of over 400 jobs to the community, loss of tax base, and loss of utility revenue to an expanded wastewater treatment plant for the Farmland plant operations. The funding requested will create a recreational hub to the State's Blazing Star Trail and the newly established State Water Trail for the Shell Rock River Watershed District; and, will serve as a regional recreation, educational, and event center benefitting the region's economy through job creation and enhanced tourism.

Project Description

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

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

The construction of a new 115,840 square foot regional center will ensure that the public is provided the opportunity to use the site and its various educational, recreational, health, civic, social resources and services, as well as community or private meetings and functions.

Project Rationale

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

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

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

Who will operate the facility?

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

Who will use or occupy this space?

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

Public Purpose

The project will provide a variety of educational, recreational, and public services to the region surrounding Albert Lea. The redevelopment and renewal of the site will improve the water quality entering Albert Lea Lake and remediate contaminated soils on the site. The project will serve as a connecting hub to the State's Blazing Star Trail and newly designated State Water Trail within the

Shell Rock River Watershed District. The project will enhance tourism and serve as a regional event center for southern and southeastern Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Chad M. Adams
City Manager
507-377-4330
cadams@ci.albertlea.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Blazing Star Landing

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,500	$11,500	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$0	$500	$0
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$14,500	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$6,600	$4,500	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$0	$3,500	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,100**	**$34,500**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$34	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,812	$340	$0
Project Management	$0	$180	$400	$0
Construction	$0	$8,144	$29,460	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$300	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$1,180	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,971	$6,140	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$12,141**	**$37,820**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Stables Sanitary Sewer and Water Extension

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,350
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$1,250,000 is being requested to extend City of Albert Lea municipal water and sanitary sewer services to the Stables Area located outside of the City limits because existing septic systems are failing and are at a high risk to contaminate ground water sources as well as surface water that will further impair water body quality within the Shell Rock River Watershed District.

Project Description

The Stables Area property owners are located about ¼ of mile outside of City limits and have been experiencing failing septic systems for the past several years. For decades, the residents of the Stables Area have requested extension of water and sanitary sewer services to their properties in conjunction with being annexed into the City of Albert Lea corporate limits. Unfortunately, the property owners have not been able to financially afford the full extension of water and sanitary sewer services to their properties. Most of the existing septic systems on the Stables Area lots are not compliant with Freeborn County zoning regulations, as septic systems require larger lot sizes. The Environmental Services Division of Freeborn County has raised concerns for many years about the failing septic systems in the Stables Area and is seeking an economically feasible solution to eliminate the failing septic systems.

The City of Albert Lea is requesting that approximately 45% of the total project be funded through State grants and the remaining 55% to be funded between the Stables Area property owners through assessments, along with tax abatement bonds from the City of Albert Lea and/or Freeborn County. The Township will also be cooperating with the City to ensure the annexation moves forward as planned and will not be seeking significant interim tax reimbursement as allowed due to the severity of the water quality concerns.

Project Rationale

Property owners within the Stables Area are not financially able to fully pay for the extension of water and sanitary sewer services. The total project budget to extend the water and sanitary sewer services to 59 homes is approximately $2,782,437 (or $47,160 per lot). The more critical sanitary sewer service extension is approximately $1,652,906 (or $28,015 per lot). The property owners in the Stables Area are willing to pay a fair assessment for the extension of the water and sanitary sewer services. However, even with a fair assessment of approximately $938,000 for the 59 properties, a funding gap remains in the amount of approximately $1,800,000.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NA

Who will own the facility?

The City of Albert Lea will own the water and sanitary sewer infrastructure.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Albert Lea will operate and maintain the water and sanitary sewer infrastructure.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

To mitigate failing septic systems and corresponding waste that is at a high risk to contaminate ground water as well as surface water which will further impair our area lakes in the Shell Rock River Watershed District. The City of Albert Lea will extend municipal water and sewer services to an area outside City limits (aka Stables Area) that has several failing septic systems.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Chad M. Adams
City Manager
507-377-4330
cadams@ci.albertlea.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Stables Sanitary Sewer and Water Extension

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,350	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$450	$0	$0
County Funds	$0	$242	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$938	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,980**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$206	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$250	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,326	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$198	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,980**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Appleton Township — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
100TH ST SW Road Upgrade	1	GO	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

100TH ST SW Road Upgrade

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$1 million is state funds is requested to upgrade a one mile section of township gravel road (100th St SW) to a paved 10 ton class road. This project will connect State Trunk Highways 119 and 7 one mile south of Appleton, MN.

Project Description

This project will encompass paving a one mile section of township gravel road (100th St SW) upgrading it to a 10 ton class road. This road will connect State Trunk Highways 119 and 7. On each side of this mile long stretch of 100 St SW there are triangle intersections connecting to State Highway 119 and State Highway 7. This project would eliminate both triangle intersections and replace them with 90 degree intersections to both state highways. On the east part of this road the triangle intersection crosses the Twin Cities & Western railway in two spots. This project would eliminate those two crossings replacing them with one perpendicular crossing. There are 16 high line power poles located on the north side of this road. They will need to be moved to the north approximately 10 feet along with relocating some power poles on the east triangle corner as well. Costs for this project are estimated to run at 1 million dollars which include the following: Grading, placement of eighteen inches of class 5 gravel and four inches of asphalt on approximately 6000 linear feet of gravel road. Road tie-ins will be redone on the ends to Highway 119 and Highway 7 per MN DOT approval. Electrical power line relocation and new signage. Additional creation of a frontage road located north of Highway 7 opposite of the new east intersection to improve traffic flow from the north and east as per MN DOT specifications.

Project Rationale

In Appleton, there is a difficult corner to make connecting State Highway 7 to State Highway 119. Truck semitrailer traffic must make a severe 35 degree turn to get on 119 and must also yield to traffic going south onto 119 from Highway 7 coming from the north. There is a curve in Hwy 7 at this location which makes it difficult to see traffic coming from the north before making your turn to the south onto 119. Also, north bound traffic pulls right up to Highway 7 making room to complete the turn to the south hazardous with a semitrailer. To help solve the issue with semitrailer truck traffic at the corner described above, we are proposing to upgrade a mile section of township gravel road located one mile south of this corner by paving it to a 10 ton class road.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

One year funding for construction of the road upgrade.

Who will own the facility?

Appleton Township

Who will operate the facility?

Appleton Township

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Public Road

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Chris Aasland
Township Supervisor
320-297-0644
chrisa@west-con.com

($ in thousands)

100TH ST SW Road Upgrade

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$15	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,015**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$15	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,015**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Appleton, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Pioneer Public TV	1	GO	$ 3,250	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,250	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,250	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Pioneer Public TV

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,250
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$3.25 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, design, construct, furnish and equip a regional public television studio and office building, with the restoration of an adjacent building for regional arts, public performance, recording and community engagement and education.

Project Description

The project is based on Pioneer Public Television's need to enhance their facility and production capacity to serve the needs of the region; and to use this opportunity as a method to build innate community stability and to spur long term economic planning and revitalization in the region. This project in Appleton, Minnesota involves the construction of a new studio and office building, purchase of adjacent property to facilitate that construction, and the renovation of a historic former city hall building for regional performance arts recording and community engagement. The total estimated cost of $6.4 million would be funded through local and regional private fundraising by Pioneer, and state capital budget appropriations. The application for this capital request is being made by the City of Appleton. New construction would include approximately 22,000 square feet, renovation and restoration of existing buildings would include approximately 10,000 square feet.

Pioneer Public Television – the only local broadcast television content provider for most small, rural communities in west central and southwestern Minnesota currently operating in studios and production spaces that do not accommodate HD productions, which are becoming an industry norm and will likely soon be bypassed by the next generation of production technology. Pioneer recognizes they need to keep up with contemporary production and distribution standards in order to maintain their ability to provide local, regional and national news and entertainment programming to a very large service area.

Pioneer currently owns an office building located at 120 West Schlieman Avenue and the adjacent, historic City Hall and Opera House at 23 South Miles Street (customarily referred to as the Opera House). The current studios are located in the 23 South Miles building. 120 West Schlieman was built in the 1980s for Pioneer. It has a connection to the Opera House's first floor that was added at the time 120 West Schliemann was built.

As the result of a strategic planning process in 2010/2011, Pioneer's board and staff recognized that its future operational needs could not be met within the two existing buildings. Neither building is able to accommodate High Definition television studios - due to their much larger size, approximately 40' x 50' x 20' tall for the larger of the two studios - and the necessary adjacent spaces, such as control rooms, equipment rooms, the Green Room, and other support spaces.

As part of this project, Pioneer is working with the City of Appleton to sell the existing office building at 120 West Schlieman to the city for its future use as a community library. This sale will create a strong future partnership with a library adjacent to the restored original City Hall and Opera House.

The sale will also assist Pioneer with raising funds needed for the planned new facility.

Pioneer believes that a restored and modernized Opera House building at 23 South Miles will function as an important regional performance venue for live audience productions and community engagement. To function as such, the space requires several things:

- An elevator to make the space accessible; the entire building is currently non-accessible
- An updated HVAC system that responds to the heating/cooling requirements of an audience and theater lighting – the existing system is inadequate to heat the space in winter and has no cooling capacity
- Modern theatrical lighting and sound systems capable of supporting HD regional television productions
- Addressing water damage and failing windows that threaten the long term viability of this building that is listed on the National Historic Register
- Better back stage support space, such as a Green Room, restrooms and changing rooms
- Remodeling the existing first floor to allow for community engagement spaces to convene public listening sessions or town meetings, tele-conference meetings, or educational sessions

Thus, after careful consideration, Pioneer came to the conclusion that it was necessary to build a new facility on adjacent property to the south of the Opera House, and connect to the Opera House to better support the reuse of it as an active venue for production and regional community engagement. To make way for the new studio/office facility, it is necessary to move an existing workshop building, and purchase adjacent buildings. Pioneer has started discussions with the landowners, and they are supportive of this project.

The Opera House was purchased by Pioneer in 1980 for $1 from the city. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Second floor structural joists rest upon exterior and interior bearing walls, which limit reconfiguration of the first floor. The second floor is an open auditorium space that can accommodate performances for up to 300 patrons. There is minimal backstage space. The existing HVAC system cannot adequately heat the Opera House for human habitation, much less comfort. There is limited air conditioning. There are inadequate restrooms per building code and to be considered a modern performance space. Also, there is no elevator, rendering the space inaccessible to many expected patrons who are elderly or disabled.

The Opera House needs long term, capital maintenance work to prepare it for the next generation of its life, including brick tuck-pointing, foundation stabilization at its northeast corner, and updating of HVAC systems to accommodate performance space crowds. Window repair - and possible window replacement – is desperately needed in quite a few locations. Some areas of the first floor of the Opera House have been substantially renovated and all historic distinction removed. However, the Opera House space and the building's exterior remain a significant example of Richardsonian Romanesque civic buildings typical of the late 19th century. In discussion with the State Office of Historic Preservation, it is our understanding that the areas of the Opera House that have not been previously been altered will be subject to compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Renovation and Guidelines for Rehabilitation.

Renovation of the existing building to accommodate HD production studios was investigated. But the Opera House cannot be modified without compromising its historic character and the entire roof of the 120 West Schliemann building would need to be lifted at least 12' to accommodate HD production studios. Thus neither existing building is appropriate for the future of Pioneer Public

Television's production needs. However, the Opera House is critical to Pioneer's future vision.

The impact of building a new studio/office facility, restoring the Opera House, and the sale of Pioneer's current building to the City of Appleton for a library, will be dramatic. The block will be transformed into an area with modern production studios, a restored historic arts performance auditorium, and community engagement center adjacent to a new local library, with increased accessibility for all.

Project Rationale

This project is needed to provide improved regional public television service to western Minnesota through the construction of a new TV studio, a regional media community engagement center, and the restoration of regional arts performance center.

Other Considerations

This project is required, in part, by changes in technology. The current studio space is severely restricted in a building that is more than 100 years old, and it is inadequate for digital production. Program offerings and community service will be enhanced by having the upgraded facilities adjacent to a local library.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project will not have any impact on the budget

Who will own the facility?

City of Appleton

Who will operate the facility?

Pioneer Public Television

Who will use or occupy this space?

Pioneer Public Television is a public television station that has served western Minnesota since 1966. Pioneer will use the new facility for recording television productions, hosting regional arts events, and regional public events related to television and online programming. The facility would be occupied by Pioneer's staff of more than 20 people. Pioneer would lease the building from the City of Appleton.

Public Purpose

The public purpose would be to record and broadcast regional television programs, such as town hall meetings on important public issues, arts events such as musical performances, and provide public engagement and education space for a greater understanding of the issues and arts in western Minnesota communities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Roman Fidler
City Clerk/Treasurer
320-289-1363
roman@appletonmn.org

($ in thousands)

Pioneer Public TV

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,250	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$3,250	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$211	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$114	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,693	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$47	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$503	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$932	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Arrowhead Regional Corrections — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements	1	GO	$ 2,853	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,853	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,853	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,853
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Revitalization and enhancement of the buildings that support vocational and educational programming at the Northeast Regional Corrections Center (NERCC). Total cost of the project is $2.85 million.

Project Description

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

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

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

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

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

Project Rationale

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

Other Considerations

The five counties of ARC have invested more than $6.5 million into an $11 million project since 2012. To date, the State of Minnesota has contributed $737,000 in 2012, $1 million in 2014 and $1.2 million in 2015. By necessity, projects in correctional facilities must be completed in phases. This request allows NERCC to move to the next phase of the project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Arrowhead Regional Corrections.

Who will operate the facility?

Arrowhead Regional Corrections.

Who will use or occupy this space?

144 bed correctional facility for adult men.

Public Purpose

NERCC provides for the public safety of the Arrowhead region.

Description of Previous Appropriations

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

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

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

Project Contact Person

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

($ in thousands)

NERCC Vocational Programming Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$2,937	$2,853	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Local Government Funds	$7,737	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$10,674**	**$2,853**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$10,674	$2,567	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$286	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$10,674**	**$2,853**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Association of Metro Municipalities — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Inflow-Infiltration Capital Bonding Request	1	GO	$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Inflow-Infiltration Capital Bonding Request

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$7,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The Association of Metropolitan Municipalities is requesting $7 million in state bond funding to assist cities in the metropolitan area to correct inflow and infiltration problems in municipal wastewater collection systems.

Project Description

The Association of Metropolitan Municipalities is seeking a $7 million capital bonding appropriation to assist metro area cities in mitigating inflow and infiltration (I/I) problems in municipal wastewater systems. Inflow and infiltration are terms for the ways that clear water (ground and storm) makes its way into sanitary sewer pipes and is then treated, unnecessarily, at regional wastewater treatment plants. I/I enters the system from a variety of sources including cracks, leaky pipe joints, deteriorated manholes, and through storm water that enters the system through rain leaders, or illegal foundation drains or sump pumps connected to sanitary sewer pipes.

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

Project Rationale

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

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

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

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

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

Who will operate the facility?

Metro area local units of government.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Description of Previous Appropriations

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

Project Contact Person

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

($ in thousands)

Association of Metropolitan Municipalities Inflow-Infiltration Capital Bonding Request

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$9,000	$7,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$9,000**	**$14,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$1,800	$2,800	$0	$0
Project Management	$450	$700	$0	$0
Construction	$6,750	$10,500	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$9,000**	**$14,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Aurora, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
East Mesabi Joint Water System	1	GO	$ 4,000	$ 13,000	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,000	$ 13,000	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,000	$ 13,000	$ 0

($ in thousands)

East Mesabi Joint Water System

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	We are requesting $4,000,000 in state funds for the pre-design/design of the East Mesabi Joint Water System including treatment plant and distribution.

Project Description

This request is for $4 M in state funding to acquire land, predesign and design a new water treatment and distribution system for the communities of Hoyt Lakes, Aurora, Town of White, and Biwabik. After predesign & design is completed, we will be applying for additional bonding bill funds for the construction of the water treatment plant and distribution system. Total estimated cost for construction is $26 million.
The City of Biwabik currently uses the Canton Mine Pit as its source for drinking water. Several years ago ArcelorMittal mining company began dewatering at their East Reserve Mine site adjacent to the Canton Pit. The water elevation in the Canton Pit is lowering and will force the City of Biwabik to find a different source for their water supply. The City of Biwabik began to evaluate options for a new water source and began the discussion with neighboring communities to determine if a collaborative joint water system would be more cost effective and efficient than each community continuing with their own systems.

The communities of Hoyt Lakes, Aurora, Town of White Biwabik and Gilbert have been meeting for over a year to discuss various options for a joint water system. They through the East Range Joint Powers Board, the communities received a $30,000 grant to start the preliminary planning and design for this new system which was completed at the end of August 2011. This new system would include one central water treatment plant with a system of distribution lines that would connect to each of the member communities.

Currently each individual community system is being evaluated for water quality, condition of existing facilities, water treatment alternatives and community interconnections.

Completion of this project will ensure a more economical approach to these member communities in providing quality water to their residents and will drastically reduce their annual operating and maintenance costs.

Project Rationale

Currently, the neighboring communities of Aurora (including portions of the Town of White), Biwabik, and Hoyt Lakes each own and operate their own water supply, treatment and distribution system. Each of the systems are facing significant near term and long range challenges. To address these challenges, the potential for a joint water system with the communities of Biwabik, Aurora, Town of White and Hoyt Lakes has been evaluated in the past. A joint water system provides economies of

scale for the member communities and offers more reliability than separate systems.

Other Considerations

The existing independently owned and operated water supplies will be abandoned as drinking water sources. Individual treatment facilities will be decommissioned and either re-purposed or demolished based on communities preference. Distribution systems that are currently in place will be used as part of the new systems infrastructure.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The facility will be owned by the communities of Aurora, Biwabik, Hoyt Lakes and the Town of White.

Who will operate the facility?

Facility will be operated by the existing water plant operator employees within the partnering communities.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The four East Range communities including all residents and businesses in each community.

Public Purpose

Provide municipal water services to the communities involved.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Britt See-Benes
Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer
218-229-2614
britt@ci.aurora.mn.us

($ in thousands)

East Mesabi Joint Water System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$4,000	$13,000	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Local Government Funds	$30	$900	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$0	$13,000	$0
TOTAL	**$30**	**$4,900**	**$26,000**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$100	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$405	$0	$0
Design Fees	$30	$3,620	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$24,000	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$775	$2,000	$0
TOTAL	**$30**	**$4,900**	**$26,000**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Baxter, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Cypress Drive Extension Project	1	GO	$ 4,978	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,978	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,978	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Cypress Drive Extension Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,978
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$4.978 million in state funds is requested to acquire, predesign, design, and Cypress Drive improvements in Baxter, Minnesota.

Project Description

Street / Project Name: Cypress Drive (MSAS 113) Extension

Termini: Excelsior Road (MSAS 106) to College Road (MSAS 103)

Length: 0.69 Miles

Cost: $9,957,000 excluding ROW

Construction Year: 2018

Functional Classification: Urban Minor Arterial

Projected 20-year Average Daily Traffic Volume: 20,000

Project Description: Construct Cypress Drive from Excelsior Road to College Road to 4-lane divided urban with 12' trail, sidewalk, roundabout, traffic signal, lighting; Install railroad signals and gates.

The City will provide the 50% match – $4.978 Million from a variety of local sources including private investment, arterial/collector street fund, and bonding.

Project Rationale

The City of Baxter has limited north / south roadway connectivity east of TH 371 and across the east / west BNSF Railway corridor that splits the City. TH 371 serves as a Principal Arterial in the roadway network. The system lacks a parallel supporting roadway to better serve shorter trips or regional trips with local destinations. This condition creates inconvenient local travel patterns and overburdens TH 371, adding to safety issues and congestion problems. Lack of local connectivity constrains opportunities for private investment and development growth.

The proposed improvements to Cypress Drive will give direct access to commercial and residential development that is currently underway, just north of TH 210. Additionally, the roadway corridor will give direct access from TH 210 south to the City of Baxter's established and expanding Industrial Park, as well as undeveloped industrial land owned by BNSF. The completed Cypress Drive corridor will provide a convenient alternate detour route for TH 371 traffic during maintenance closures of the at grade railroad crossing at TH 210.

This project will also provide relief to one of the busiest intersections in Greater Minnesota – TH 371 and TH 210, with a (2011) ADT of 20,000 vehicles. Cypress Drive is projected to serve 20,000 vehicles per day in 2025.

There is an economic development component to this project as well. It will provide improved access to industrial, commercial, and residential areas currently under development and underserved. The existing industrial area south of the track has well over 1,000 of jobs, and with this project, the number of jobs will increase. The project is needed so that the existing businesses in this park can grow and it will help in new business attraction.

Other Considerations

The City already has invested substantial time and money in this corridor:

- The City has been planning this corridor since the 1970's.
- The City has worked with railroad and transportation partners to close 5 crossings in Baxter since 1980, and all existing crossings have been upgraded with modern railroad signal systems including gates.
- Multiple traffic studies have been commissioned with participation by regional transportation partners and the railroad.
- Portions of the ultimate build-out of Cypress Drive between CSAH 48 and CSAH 49 have been constructed.
- The current project is programmed in the City's 5-year Capital Improvement Plan for construction in 2018.
- The City has invested over $1,000,000 in this project demonstrating their commitment to the corridor.
- The City has purchased the necessary corridor right of way between TH 210 and Railroad.
- The City has purchased 2 of 5 homes along the Cypress Drive corridor between Industrial Park Road and College Road.
- The City obtained Level 2 Layout approval from MnDOT for layouts for TH210 signalized intersection, Excelsior Road roundabout, and railroad crossing.
- In February 2014, secured $429,908 in FY 2018 Local Surface Transportation Program federal funding for railroad crossing improvements at Cypress Drive; included in the 2015 to 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The new street will be included within the city's street maintenance program - snow plowing will be funded from the annual budget and pavement maintenance will be funded from the pavement management fund.

Who will own the facility?

City of Baxter

Who will operate the facility?

City of Baxter

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

Public road - to move goods, services and people efficiently and safely.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Gordon Heitke
City Administrator
218-454-5105
gheitke@baxtermn.gov

($ in thousands)

Cypress Drive Extension Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$4,978	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$4,979	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$9,957**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,739	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$7,074	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,144	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$9,957**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Bemidji, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Regional Dental Facility	1	GO	$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
Bemidji Carnegie Library Rehabilitation	2	GO	$ 700	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 6,700	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 6,700	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Regional Dental Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$6 Million in state funds is requested, to construct a new, larger community clinic facility for Northern Dental Access Center, to be located in Bemidji Minnesota.

Project Description

Northern Dental Access Center is located near the health care campus in northern Bemidji. Sanford Health has committed the donation of 4 acres of property within that campus to support the construction of a new community dental clinic. This pledge has an estimated value of $500,000.

A 22,000 square foot building will be constructed, with 18 dental operatories and ample space for partner agencies to provide patient support services on-site. The total cost for site preparation, design, construction, equipment, furniture and fixtures and relocation is estimated at $9,000,000.

The building will be a steel frame commercial structure, with a garage and 100 space parking lot. It will be handicap accessible, have its own denture lab, and conference/training space for students from higher education programs throughout the state. The location will be adjacent to Minnesota Highways 71N and 2W, easily accessible by people traveling to the Bemidji area.

Northern Dental Access Center has $250,000 set aside to support construction; and over $220,000 in equipment and fixtures that will be relocated to a new facility. Several private foundations are considering capital contributions toward the project and the land contribution from Sanford Health is valued at $500,000.

Project Rationale

Northern Dental Access Center in Bemidji, Minnesota is a regional community access dental clinic that provides low income people with dental care. This nonprofit organization was created through a collaboration of government, nonprofit and educational institutions; since opening in 2009, continuous growth has outpaced the capacity of the current, leased facility. The current building is old, inefficient, does not meet ADA requirements, has inadequate parking. Most importantly, the current clinic building cannot accommodate the growth in need for dental care among Medicaid enrollees.

Over 60,000 people in rural, northwest Minnesota are enrolled in Medicaid and demographic trends indicate that this number will only increase. In this medical and dental health professional shortage area, there are not enough providers who are able to accept Medicaid insurances to adequately serve this population. Alarming rates of oral disease and decay continue to comprise some of the greatest health disparities in the state.

Northern Dental Access Center now logs over 1,200 dental appointments for low income people each month, with a unique and comprehensive approach to care (this represents a 16% growth

from last year; a 35% increase in the past three years). By providing patient support services like transportation assistance, insurance counseling, legal assistance, mental health screening and referral—and more, Northern Dental has been recognized nationally as setting a new standard in culturally-competent and effective care.

In its six short years, Northern Dental has become a critical part of the health care system in the region, drawing patients from more than 100 miles—who otherwise would not have access to dental care. This helps people avoid the emergency room for dental pain and improves the overall health of the population. Tooth decay is the most common disease present in children and adults and it is 100% preventable.

A new facility is necessary to cement Northern Dental Access Center's presence, bring greater efficiencies to their work, and to serve an even greater number of low income people needing dental care.

As the only community clinic in the region, Northern Dental is also a center for preparing future health and dental care professionals—with hosting agreements with eight higher education institutions. Dental hygienists and assistances, community health workers, nursing students, and pre-dental students spend time at the clinic for job shadow, community service and internships. Negotiations are currently underway with the University of Minnesota School of Dentistry, which is planning to add four greater Minnesota dental sites to their rural dentistry program—to place 4th year dental students and dental therapy students so that they have exposure to public health dentistry.

Other Considerations

Stakeholders from all sectors throughout the region have been instrumental in the planning, fundraising and development of this community clinic. Schools, employers, government agencies, nonprofit organizations and faith communities—all share the commitment to assure that low income and vulnerable people have access to dental care. Resolutions of support have been received from:

City of Bemidji

Beltrami County

Minnesota Dental Association

University of Minnesota School of Dentistry

Bi County Community Action Council

Minnesota Hygienists Association

Bemidji Area Chamber of Commerce

Headwaters Regional Development Commission

Greater Bemidji

Legal Services of Northwest Minnesota

Evergreen Youth & Family Services

Pending are resolutions of supports from County Commissioners in Clearwater, Lake of the Woods, Pennington, Polk, Red Lake and Roseau Counties.

A new and larger community dental clinic will further improve the health outcomes of low income people in northwest Minnesota. To date, Northern Dental Access Center has reduced emergency room visits for dental pain by 30%. As Northern Dental has grown and attracted more dentists to work on-site, referrals for specialty care such as pediatric dental and oral surgery have been reduced by 30%. This is critical because specialty care (for the Medicaid population) is only available in Brainerd, Fargo, Duluth or other communities more than 100 miles away.

The current facility cannot be expanded further, yet additional dentists approach Northern Dental to offer services, and they are being turned away because the facility isn't large enough to accommodate them. Yet the waiting list for patients needing care continues to grow.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Bemidji

Who will operate the facility?

Northern Dental Access Center, a nonprofit 501(c)3 corporation, governed by a 15 member board of directors.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Northern Dental Access Center will lease the new facility from the City of Bemidji, and use it for the daily operation of a community health dental clinic. Additional community partners (nonprofit and government entities) will sublease space in the facility in order to provide services to the target population. Northern Dental Access Center is in negotiations with the University of Minnesota School of Dentistry, which is planning to expand its rural dentistry program by adding four clinical training sites in rural areas. The new clinic facility will have the capacity to house up to three 4th year dental students or dental therapy students, exposing them to the unique challenges of public health dentistry in rural and underserved areas.

Public Purpose

Northern Dental Access Center is a safety net clinic, caring for uninsured and underinsured people throughout the region. The facility operates with the third party reimbursements available for Medicaid services; grant funds and other philanthropic resources provide patient support services to strengthen the organization and provide more comprehensive care to patients in need.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Nate Mathews
City Manager
218-759-3565

nate.mathews@ci.bemidji.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Regional Dental Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Funding	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$9,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$35	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$385	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$315	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,825	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$50	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$48	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$1,310	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	($7)	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,961**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Bemidji Carnegie Library Rehabilitation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$700
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$700 thousand in state funds is requested for rehabilitation and restoration of the historic Bemidji Carnegie Library, including an ADA-accessible entrance and elevator, and ADA-accessible restrooms and renovations.

Project Description

The historic Carnegie Library was built in 1910 and has served our region in a variety of capacities for over 100 years. Since the building ceased functioning as a library in 1961, the City has leased the building to a variety of non-profit arts and education tenants. We will soon be losing our current tenants, in large part because the building is neither energy efficient nor ADA accessible.

The intent of this project is to enhance the capacity for public use and community access, which could include business and governmental uses (e.g., conference/meeting space), family and group gatherings, receptions, and other events. We also plan a permanent exhibit with displays of regional Native American history, results of the archeological study of Library Park, and the history of the Carnegie Library and Andrew Carnegie - a way to highlight the continuity of cultures on this unusual site. The lower level will include refurbished office space for tenants. The relocation away from the highway will re-establish the historical position of the Carnegie in relation to the road, and restore the original appearance.

These upgrades will assure sustainability of the building and the City's ability to lease space to one or more businesses, providing at least 5 jobs on site and additional associated jobs offsite.

Scope of Work:

§ Move the Building Back. Approximately 25,000 cars pass daily within 5 feet of the front entrance of the building. Patrons are literally at risk of falling into the traffic when exiting the building stairs. Moving the building away from Highway 197 provides a safer venue for visitors, resolves potential litigation issues arising from the proximity to the street, and eliminates the ongoing severe deterioration of the façade due to snowplow throw. Constructing a new foundation will also stabilize the structure and facilitate accessibility and needed mechanical upgrades. MN DOT and the City of Bemidji reviewed traffic & road change alternatives and concluded that there are no viable options except demolition or moving the building away from the road. The National Park Service has approved the move and the Library will remain on the National Register of Historic Places throughout and after the renovation.

§ Construct ADA Entrance and Elevator. In order to enable broader public use, accessibility issues must be resolved. The building currently does not meet accessibility requirements at the entrance or between the floors. In order to preserve its historic front facade, a new

ADA-accessible main entrance addition will be constructed to fulfill those needs. The addition will be located on the northeast side of the existing building, feature an at-grade entrance, stairs and elevator access to lower and upper levels.

§ Restrooms, Mechanical Systems, Energy Efficiency and Abatement. We will modernize the mechanical systems (heating/cooling, electrical and plumbing) to provide more efficient building operation; new, accessible restrooms that are available for park and trail users will be added; all hazardous materials will be abated; and energy efficient windows and insulation will be installed to reduce operating costs and meet B3 standards. We have incorporated significant energy conservation measures into the project specifications and systems design (based on an energy audit in conjunction with Ottertail Power and the Weidt Group Commercial Design Assistance Program).

Funding. A dedicated group of community volunteers has stepped forward to work on behalf of the Carnegie project. We have launched a capital campaign to fund a portion of the aforementioned upgrades. The total estimated cost of the project is $1.67 million. To date (August 2015), we have raised $685,000 from individuals and foundations. The City of Bemidji has added a commitment of $100,000. Our capital campaign will continue through the completion of the renovation.

We intend to apply for a Minnesota Historical and Cultural Heritage Grant in the amount of $370,000 for restoration work. However, moving the building, and constructing a new foundation and new entrance, activities that are necessary for this project, do not qualify for Historical and Cultural Heritage Grant funding.

Project Rationale

The City of Bemidji requests $700,000 in state bonding funds for the renovation and relocation of the city-owned Carnegie Library building in downtown Bemidji, Beltrami County. The project will correct long-standing safety and accessibility problems, while simultaneously improving the economic viability and sustainability of the building.

We intend to construct a new foundation, with an ADA-accessible main entrance, and rehabilitate the structure to increase its energy efficiency and functionality for public use. The building will be moved back 17 feet from State Highway 197, which over time has encroached to within 5 feet of the front entrance. This will eliminate the ongoing damage to the façade as well as the safety issues due to the proximity to traffic.

Other Considerations

Bemidji is a regional center for tourism, entertainment, shopping and the arts. Our historic downtown with its vibrant mix of waterfront, businesses, galleries, and restaurants is a key attraction. The completion of this project will preserve a unique cultural asset, increase sustainability of the building and reduce costs to taxpayers and tenants. This renovated public landmark will enhance tourism in Bemidji, leading to increased revenues for local businesses in our historic downtown. There is a strong community desire to preserve this treasured building and restore its role as a centerpiece of our community, but we need state assistance to realize that goal. Thank you for your consideration of our project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Bemidji

Who will operate the facility?

City of Bemidji

Who will use or occupy this space?

The building will support a variety of community uses and events in the upper level and as yet undetermined tenants in lower level.

Public Purpose

The restored Carnegie Library will be used as a community center for events and historical & cultural exhibits. This will also provide opportunities for visitors and residents to see the Bemidji Carnegie Library as it originally looked in 1910. This building will be accessible and usable for everyone regardless of age or disability. Fees generated from rental of the building and tenants will provide income to offset future maintenance, saving taxpayers' money.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Nate Mathews
City Manager
218-759-3565
nate.mathews@ci.bemidji.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Bemidji Carnegie Library Rehabilitation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$700	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$50	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$100	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$628	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$192	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,670**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$111	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$100	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,459	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,670**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Benton County — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 3 Reconstruction	1	GO	$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 3 Reconstruction

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $6,000,000 in state bond funds for acquisition, design, and construction for CSAH 3 improvements that will provide for improved regional transportation connections and improved mobility and safety on CSAH 3, located in the City of Sauk Rapids, Benton County.

Project Description

Solution: The preferred alternative is to rebuild CSAH 3 as a four-lane, urban, divided roadway with roundabouts at two intersections. Most of the rest of the present accesses will be converted into right-in/out accesses. As part of project, the corridor will be shifted slightly to accommodate the additional through travel lanes and to minimize right of way impacts. Right of way acquisition will include taking all of the properties immediately adjacent to CSAH 3 on side of the corridor between the alleyway north of 3rd Avenue to Summit Avenue. Additionally, some parcels will be needed on both sides of the corridor to accommodate the roundabout at 6th Avenue and improvements at 3rd Avenue. The project also includes construction of a 10 foot wide trail and 6 foot wide sidewalk. Ponding will also be provided with the project.

Project Rationale

Regional Significance: This project is a collaboration between Benton County and the City of Sauk Rapids – they have shared in the planning, funding and will continue to share in the implementation and maintenance of the project. It is critically important to both entities, and the entire St. Cloud Metropolitan Statistical Area, that the proposed CSAH 3 improvements are made as it is one of six Mississippi River Crossings in the region. In addition to providing an important river crossing, CSAH 3 is a minor arterial roadway that links Benton and Stearns Counties, links the cities of Sauk Rapids, St. Cloud and Waite Park, and provides connections to many of the area's principal arterials (US 10, TH 15, Division Street and TH 23). CSAH 3 plays a critical role in linking these communities and key destinations (hospitals, St. Cloud Technical College, and several commercial/industrial areas) and needs to be greatly improved in order to continue to provide safe and efficient connections.

Need: CSAH 3 is deficient in providing access and safety to the area. The road is currently a two-lane roadway. Two-lane roadways in urban areas can accommodate between 8,000 and 12,000 vehicles a day depending on features of the roadway. Generally roads with lower speeds, changing topography, more access, and a lack of turn lanes will accommodate less traffic; CSAH has many of these features present. The St. Cloud Area Planning Organization uses 10,000 vehicles as the capacity of a two-lane urban facility for planning purposes, if none of those features are present.

Additional information from the St. Cloud APO indicates that current traffic volumes on CSAH 3 in the project area are approximately 9,200 vehicles per day between 3rd and Summit Avenues and approximately 10,200 vehicles per day between Summit Avenue and the US 10 interchange ramp terminals. These volumes, when combined with existing roadway features, illustrate that CSAH 3 is at or very near capacity. Future volumes for 2035 are projected to be approximately 14,600 vehicles per day near 3rd Avenue and approximately 20,300 vehicles per day between Summit Avenue and the US 10 interchange terminals. The future volumes are over capacity of this two-lane roadway.

In addition to not providing sufficient capacity, CSAH 3 has been an increasing safety concern for the County and the City. Analysis of the most recent three-year crash data shows 18 crashes in the project area between January 1, 2010 and December 31, 2012. Of the 18 crashes on the corridor, 17 of them occurred at public street intersections.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project is on a County State Aid Highway. The completion of the project will have no impact to the State's operating budget, because maintenance will come from the CSAH gas tax distribution formula.

Who will own the facility?

Benton County

Who will operate the facility?

Benton County

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Public Highway with regional significance.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Chris Byrd
Public Works Director
320-968-5054
cbyrd@co.benton.mn.us

($ in thousands)

County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 3 Reconstruction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$12,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$2,738	$1,707	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$225	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$68	$355	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$460	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$6,100	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$347	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$612	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$3,378**	**$9,234**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Blaine, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Reconstruction of 105th Avenue	1	GO	$ 3,246	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,246	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,246	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Reconstruction of 105th Avenue

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,246
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Reconstruction of 105th Avenue from TH65 to CSAH52 (Radisson Road)

Project Description

105th Avenue was a county road turned back to the City in May 2015. 105th Avenue also splits the National Sports Center campus. The current roadway is a four lane undivided street that is posted at 50 mph with no pedestrian component. The City is looking to increase the safety of the corridor with the needed reconstruction. The design elements that are proposed to increase the safety are the addition of two roundabouts, raised medians, and a bituminous trail. The project is proposed to be constructed between the 2016 and 2017 USA Soccer Cup events at the National Sport Center.

Project Rationale

105th Avenue is at the end of its life cycle and needs to be reconstructed. The reconstruction is an opportunity to increase pedestrian and driver safety throughout the corridor. The introduction of two roundabouts and a raised median will slow traffic down and direct pedestrians to defined crosswalks. The addition of a bituminous trail will allow pedestrians a safe location to traverse the corridor.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional state operating funds will be requested.

Who will own the facility?

City of Blaine

Who will operate the facility?

City of Blaine

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Create a safer corridor for vehicle and pedestrian traffic

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Clark Arneson
City Manager
763-785-6121
carneson@ci.blaine.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Reconstruction of 105th Avenue

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,246	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$3,247	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,493**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$493	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,493**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	

Bloomington, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Mall of America Transit Station	1	GO	$ 11,000	$ 0	$ 0
Westbound I-494 On-Ramp at East Bush Lake Road	2	GO	$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0
I-35W/I-494 Phase I Interchange	3	THB	$ 65,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 84,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 19,000	$ 0	$ 0
Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total			$ 65,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Mall of America Transit Station

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$11,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The requested State bonding of $11 million will be used to expand capacity and renovate the 23-year old Mall of America (MOA) Transit Station. The MOA transit station is the busiest in Minnesota providing 2.1 million rides per year.

Project Description

The proposed MOA Transit Station improvements will realign and relocate the MOA Transit Station to provide bus-only entry and street presence from 24th Avenue, and a direct pedestrian connection into the interior of the MOA. Buses will enter the site directly, eliminating long queues and security check points. The busway is relocated to remove all current bus movements crossing the LRT tracks and the wait associated with LRT trains priority for entering and exiting the site. The bus layover design allows buses to arrive, layover and leave at the same location, increases bus capacity, and provides platform heights to meet various vehicle types that utilize the station. Passengers will no longer have to walk through multiple interior/exterior spaces, parking areas, or across LRT tracks to enter the station or the MOA. The project is phased so that the current transit station will continue to function while the new facility is constructed, so there will be minimal, or no, temporary shutdown of the facility.

Project Rationale

The original station was designed for buses only, however, in 2004 the station was retrofitted to accommodate the Blue Line LRT with the installation of LRT tracks at the center of a platform area, addition of gates, and priority movement given to the LRT operation. The existing facility requires buses to wait in a mixed traffic security queue which can stretch out over a block. Buses must then pass through the security gate, and wait at a gate before crossing the LRT tracks. Bus layover maneuver requires the buses to drop off, layover, and pick up at different locations resulting in multiple trips through the facility and multiple crossings at LRT tracks. The buses also have to wait at a traffic signal upon leaving the site. These current conditions add 4.5 minutes per trip to Metro Transit and MVTA routes, and 2.5 minutes to the Red Line BRT.

Other Considerations

Due to economic development in and around the MOA, ridership is expected to increase from the current 2.1 million rides per year up to 2.6 million rides, in the opening year of the project (2017). The project improves connectivity to employment and education, and provides a viable transportation alternative to a population who may not have automobile option. The MOA Transit Station renovation will produce a fully functional transportation facility that will increase transit ridership and will support transit oriented development and larger trip generators, such as the Mall of

America.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The MOA Transit Station will improve the efficiency of all bus routes using the station.

Who will own the facility?

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

The busiest transit station in the state of Minnesota is 23-years old and needs to be expanded and renovated to accommodate the existing level of usage by LRT and buses.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Shelly Pederson
City Engineer
952-563-4866
spederson@BloomingtonMN.gov

($ in thousands)

Mall of America Transit Station

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$11,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$25,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,300	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$700	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$21,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,195	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$27,195**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Westbound I-494 On-Ramp at East Bush Lake Road

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$8 million in state funds is requested to design and construct the westbound I-494 on-ramp at East Bush Lake Road in the Normandale Lake District of Bloomington.

Project Description

Bloomington, working with other key stakeholders Edina, Hennepin County, and MnDOT, has pursued many options to achieve westbound access to I-494. These efforts resulted in an innovative inverted loop design that accomplishes the westbound access and does not disturb the existing freight and commercial delivery railroad tracks just west of East Bush Lake Road, which was the biggest roadblock to the project.

The inverted loop design allows northbound and southbound traffic on East Bush Lake Road to access eastbound or westbound I-494 through the same traffic signal system on the south side of the East Bush Lake Road bridge over I-494. The bridge accommodates future designs for the I-494 corridor and this inverted loop design can be implemented without re-working any of the existing infrastructure that was completed in this area (adding a third general purpose lane to the I-494 corridor).

The estimated total project cost is $23.8 million. The City of Bloomington has been awarded a Federal grant in the amount of $7.28 million and Hennepin County has committed $8.5 million. The remaining gap is approximately $8 million.

Project Rationale

The interchange at East Bush Lake Road and I-494 has been without a westbound I-494 on-ramp since the original construction in 1960. Since that time, development and redevelopment has occurred in the Normandale Lake are of Bloomington with the emergence of a number of high-rise office towers, hotels, townhomes, high-rise condominiums, and apartments. A westbound ramp would relieve traffic problems in the area and assist in smoother operation of the already congested interchanges at Truck Highway 100 and I-494.

Other Considerations

Many of the necessary steps to move forward with the project have been completed, including:

- Environmental review including Categorical Exemption status received
- Traffic modeling completed
- Right-of-way needs evaluated and no right-of-way is needed.

- Layout completed
- Interchange Warrant Analysis completed; and
- Federal Highway Administration and Minnesota Department of Transportation endorsement received.

In addition, two-thirds of the funding is committed by a Federal grant and Hennepin County.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minnesota Department of Transportation and Hennepin County already plow in the area, so there will be minimal additional impact regarding snow removal and salting operations. An additional bridge will be constructed, so a bridge inspection schedule will need to be added.

Who will own the facility?

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

This westbound on-ramp has been missing from the interstate system and constructing it will relieve traffic congestion in the area, as well as provide smoother operation at the already congested interchange at Trunk Highway 100 and I-494.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Shelly Pederson
City Engineer
952-563-4866
spederson@BloomingtonMN.gov

($ in thousands)

Westbound I-494 On-Ramp at East Bush Lake Road

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$8,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$0	$7,280	$0	$0
County Funds	$0	$700	$7,800	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$15,980**	**$7,800**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$380	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,772	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$21,628	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$23,780**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

I-35W/I-494 Phase I Interchange

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$65,000
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	$65 million in state funds is requested to design and construct Phase 1 interchange improvements for the I-35W and I-494 interchange located in Bloomington and Richfield.

Project Description

The Minnesota Department of Transportation's 2013 Rescoping Project recommended a "turbine interchange" for the congested I-35W and I-494 interchange that could be constructed in phase. The entire interchange turbine design, projected to be completed for $255 million, is an important project for the metro area with both traffic and development potential. Phased construction will make this concept a reality.

Phase 1 interchange improvements would include making temporary lanes to accommodate rerouted traffic, rebuilding of the 82nd Street bridge over I-35W, and constructing access from northbound I-35W to westbound I-494. This portion of the phase 1 project is estimated to cost $65 million. The Phase 1 project accommodates alternative transportation in the form of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station with a park-and-ride ramp that is intended to be funded by other Federal funding (FTA).

Project Rationale

The junction of I-35W and I-494 is the busiest and one of the most congested and unsafe intersections in Minnesota. Designed almost 60 years ago with very few modifications since, the over-capacity interchange carries nearly 500,000 vehicles each day, with many vehicle crashes occurring in and around the area. The I-494 corridor commute is ranked as the 17th worst commute in the entire nation. Approximately 21 percent of metro area jobs are located along the I-494 corridor. Conditions will continue to deteriorate if improvements are not made soon.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minnesota Department of Transportation already provide maintenance to the existing interchange, which consists of bridge structures and ramps. The additional maintenance should be minimal.

Who will own the facility?

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Department of Transportation

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

The interchange carries nearly 500,000 vehicles per day. In addition, Phase 1 improvements are planned to accommodate the planned Orange Line BRT project.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Shelly Pederson
City Engineer
952-563-4862
spederson@BloomingtonMN.gov

($ in thousands)

I-35W/I-494 Phase I Interchange

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
Trunk Highway Bonds	$0	$65,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$65,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$5,000	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$500	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$8,000	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$48,500	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$65,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Cambridge, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
State Trunk Highway 95 Improvement	1	THB	$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0
East Central Regional Library Headquarters and Cambridge Public Library	2	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 17,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Trunk Highway Bonds (THB) Total			$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

State Trunk Highway 95 Improvement

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$15,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$15 million in state funds is requested for design, right of way acquisition, and construction for the improvement of Trunk Highway 95 in Cambridge, Minnesota.

Project Description

Trunk Highway 95 in Cambridge was recently widened to four lanes with left turn lanes from Emerson Street east to County Road 2. This greatly improved traffic operations and safety in that section. There has been significant economic growth along that section and congestion has been almost eliminated. The remaining 1.5 miles of two through lanes includes the downtown district, school area, industrial park access, and railroad crossing, sections having an even greater need for increased capacity. This two lane section currently carries 12,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day which is close to maximum capacity considering the turning volumes.

A recent comprehensive traffic safety study of two schools indicated a congested intersection on TH 95 was one of two major sources of congestion and safety concern at the schools, which are actually a block north of TH 95. With rail traffic increasing (estimated at 20 trains per day), the railroad crossing is becoming a major barrier to traffic flow and economic growth. It is limiting the growth of the City's existing businesses and hampering our ability to attract more businesses.

The City of Cambridge has spent approximately $35 Million over the past 15 years improving alternate transportation routes to help alleviate TH 95 congestion. These projects include the entire downtown area, Opportunity Boulevard, South Garfield Street, South Dellwood Street, 11th Ave S, all of Main Street, and the Rum River Bridge. The City has worked with MNDOT on access management along TH 95. Even with this high level of local effort, TH 95 congestion and traffic volumes have increased. By comparison, design, right of way acquisition, and construction of a four lane section is estimated to cost $15 Million.

Most of the economic growth in the TH 95 corridor has been along the new four lane section where cross street traffic has reasonable access and traffic operation is efficient. Businesses along and near the two lane section are reluctant to make improvements and the two lane section does not seem attractive to new businesses.

The City of Cambridge has spent approximately $35 Million over the last 15 years improving alternate transportation routes (entire downtown area, Opportunity Boulevard, S. Garfield Street, 11th Ave. S., S. Dellwood Street, entire length of Main Street, Rum River Bridge), in hopes of alleviating the TH95 congestion. However, the economic development of this area has grown substantially over the last decade and surpassing what improvements the City can afford. If nothing is done, it will limit the region's economic growth due to congestion and adversely impact safety.

Project Rationale

Trunk Highway 95 currently carries between 12,000 and 23,000 vehicles per day at different locations in Cambridge. The volume of traffic on TH 95 combined with a number of signalized intersections and high volumes of cross street traffic create significant congestion. TH 95 is a major east/west corridor in East Central Minnesota carrying a high volume of commercial traffic to and through Cambridge, which adds to the congestion. Since Cambridge is the major economic, employment, education, and government center in the area, there is a high volume of turning traffic and cross street traffic along TH 95.

Adding a second lane in each direction would significantly reduce congestion and increase transportation system efficiency in Cambridge. The second lane would reduce the impacts of slow moving commercial traffic and right turning traffic at intersections and commercial driveways.

Congestion is also created by the at-grade railroad crossing on TH 95 in the center of Cambridge where high traffic volumes occur. Currently there are an average of 14 trains and rail crossing closures per day. The closures average seven minutes each. However, when trains are off-loading propane cars at Federated Coop each week, the rail closures average 12 minutes. A 7-12 minute closure of a highway carrying 14,000 vehicles per day creates significant backup and delay and normal traffic flow does not return until 15 to 20 minutes after the closure ends. A single rail crossing closure can create a 20 to 30 minute period of increased congestion and delay on TH 95 and on cross streets.

Adding a second lane will reduce the length of the rail crossing backup, in turn reducing the added congestion at intersections and commercial driveways created by the backup. The second lane will also reduce the amount of time it takes for traffic flow to return to normal. Cross street traffic, generated not only by residential trips but the economic, employment, education, and governmental activities in Cambridge, currently faces congestion and delay at TH 95 due to the long lines of single lane traffic traveling on TH 95. A second lane on TH 95 will reduce the length of the traffic lines, allowing more opportunities for vehicles to cross or enter Highway 95.

Other Considerations

Although this is a state highway, the City has led efforts to identify improvement opportunities, including reprogramming the MNDOT traffic signal system, and conducting a comprehensive corridor study which involved representatives from MNDOT, the City of Cambridge, East Central Regional Development Commission, Isanti County Board, Isanti County Highway Department, Cambridge Township, Isanti Township, Anoka Hennepin Community College, Cambridge-Isanti ISD 911, Cambridge Medical Center, BNSF Railroad, US House, local businesses and residents.

Options identified:

- Widen Highway 95 to 4 lanes: +/- $15 Million
- Highway 95 over Railroad: +/- $20 Million
- Highway 95 under Railroad: +/- $25 Million
- Railroad over Highway 95: +/- $45 Million

After reviewing all options, this committee recommended widening Highway 95 to four lanes. MNDOT agreed with the recommendation.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

MNDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MNDOT

Who will use or occupy this space?

None.

Public Purpose

State trunk highway system – to move goods, services and people efficiently and safely.

Description of Previous Appropriations

$1.8 million for engineering, preliminary environmental, and right of way acquisition (2015 Legislative Session)

Project Contact Person

Lynda Woulfe
City Administrator
763-552-3216
lwoulfe@ci.cambridge.mn.us

($ in thousands)

State Trunk Highway 95 Improvement

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
Trunk Highway Bonds	$0	$15,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$1,800	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$1,800**	**$15,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$1,450	$6,100	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$350	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$650	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$6,527	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,723	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,800**	**$15,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

East Central Regional Library Headquarters and Cambridge Public Library

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$2 million in state funds is requested to acquire, predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new library and office headquarters for the East Central Regional Library (ECRL) system to be located in Cambridge, Minnesota. The headquarters space will have offices, meeting space, work space for book circulation to all branches and will be attached to the Cambridge Public Library which will have meetings rooms, study space, a Teen area, a childrens area, and a large community room. The existing ECRL headquarters and library is in very poor condition and may be sold or redeveloped by Isanti County. Isanti County is the current owner (landlord) of the building where ECRL headquarters and Cambrige public library are currently located.

Project Description

A new library of 30,000 gross square footage on 4.5 acres is proposed.

$6,750,000	Construction
$1,043,500	Acquisition, Architectural, Engineering
$892,238	Fixtures, Furnishings, and Equipment (FFE)
$8,685,738	TOTAL

Project Rationale

The Cambridge Public Library was built 55 years ago and remodeled in 1974. The library is one of 14 branch libraries of the ECRL system, occupying the main floor and the ECRL headquarters is in the basement of the building. Despite significant increase in population and demand for meeting and reading spaces, the library has the same square footage. The library receives heavy use in reading programs, children's programs and after school programs. Additionally, community and local groups use the library often. There are no meeting rooms, program rooms or study spaces available within the current library building. Improvements in technology, electrical loads and computer demand cannot be accommodated in this building due to concrete floors and walls that limit plugged in use. The existing building is worn, lacks daylight in people spaces, has poor lighting, inconsistent temperature control, insufficient parking, and at times receives water in the lower level.

Other Considerations

The City will be holding a local referendum to support the issuance of $8,000,000 in general obligation debt for the construction of the library and East Central Regional Library Headquarters. The City may also hold a referendum on a local option sales tax to support the debt issuance.

In addition to the new library building, the project is intended to eventually include a future Community

Center Building and an adjacent outdoor pool facility, as well as parking to accommodate both buildings and the pool.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No impact on the State's operating budget. The City's operating budget for library systems will increase due to the additional square footage of the building, but increased costs may be offset through energy savings.

Who will own the facility?

City of Cambridge

Who will operate the facility?

City of Cambridge

Who will use or occupy this space?

None.

Public Purpose

Provide increased and enhanced library space along with headquarters space for ECRL, which strengthens communities by connecting people with resources, spaces, and educational experiences that enrich and empower their lives through the regional library system. ECRL serves libraries in East Central Minnesota in Aitkin, Chisago, Isanti, Kanabec, Mille Lacs, and Pine counties. ECRL Headquarters is the backbone for the East Central library system. It provides management, IT, book circulation, and personnel management from its headquarters space. It serves 14 libraries in Pine, Isanti, Chisago, Kanabec, and Mille Lacs counties. This centralized management reduces overhead expenses for the ECRL system.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Lynda Woulfe
City Administrator
763-552-3216
lwoulfe@ci.cambridge.mn.us

($ in thousands)

East Central Regional Library Headquarters and Cambridge Public Library

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$6,686	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,686**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$350	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$694	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$6,750	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$893	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,801	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,488**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
CIRSSD Mercury Treatment	1	GO	$ 2,250	$ 0	$ 0
CIRSSD Inflow/Infiltration Reduction	2	GO	$ 4,700	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 6,950	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 6,950	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

CIRSSD Mercury Treatment

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,250
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Request $2.25 million in state funds to design, construct, furnish and equip a new Tertiary Mercury Treatment Facility and related improvements for the Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District at its new treatment facility located in Chisholm, MN.

Project Description

On March 9, 2015 the CIRSSD Board adopted and authorized submission of its Mercury Treatment Facility Plan; dated February 9, 2015 to the MPCA for review and comment. MPCA approved the Facility Plan on June 26, 2015. The Facility Plan recommended design and construction of a Mercury Treatment Building which would contain "Cloth Disc Filter Technology" which was pilot tested at the CIRSSD Wastewater Treatment Facility in 2014 and found to be effective in removing Total Mercury to acceptable levels. In addition, the plan calls for ancillary pumping, mixing and chemical addition equipment as well electrical, instrumentation and control systems within the Mercury Treatment Building and adjacent unit processes. The estimated total cost of the project is $4.5 million. The project is listed on the MPCA Project Priority List as Project #279367, Ranked 11th with 86 Priority Points. As such, the project is eligible for funding under the Point Source Implementation Grant program for up to 50% of the eligible project cost. The CIRSSD anticipated applying to the Iron Range Resource and Rehabilitation Board for additional financial support in addition to the CIRSSD's local contribution.

The Mercury Treatment Facility was not part of the initial design/construction of the original CIRSSD project. The District's NPDES Permit allowed the CIRSSD additional time to study the concentration, mass and characteristics of Mercury and other constituents in the new combined wastewater flow of the member communities as well as "Pilot" technology for its removal. This allowed the District and their consulting engineers to study, recommend and design a Tertiary Mercury Treatment Facility based upon actual flow data and the performance of the new secondary treatment facility to remove Mercury.

Project Rationale

The Mercury Treatment Facility is required to comply with the Final Total Mercury Discharge Limits mandated by EPA/MPCA through the enforcement of the CIRSSD's NPDES/SDS Permit No. MN0020117, which requires achieving final limits by March 23, 2017.

Other Considerations

The CIRSSD has committed to $8,120,363.00 in State Revolving Fund Loans for the construction of the District's conveyance and treatment facilities recently commissioned in 2014. In addition, as a requirement of the District's NPDES/SDS Permit, the District committed to an additional $600,000.00

in State Revolving Fund Loan for the mandated demolition of the decommissioned Chisholm and Buhl Wastewater Treatment facilites prior to 12/31/14. Without additional financial assistance, the District, member communities and their citizenry could add an additional $2,250,000 in long-term debt.

The strict discharge limits imposed on the CIRSSD and a hand full of other small to medium size Iron Range communities are some of the most stringent in the State of Minnesota. The limits are driven by the requirements of the Great Lakes Initiative and the Bi-National Agreement to preserve the Great Lakes as directed through EPA and enforced by MPCA. Compliance with these requirements and the "Advance Treatment Technologies" needed are very expensive and are being mandated on the communities least able to bear the cost.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District

Who will operate the facility?

Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

The CIRSSD Facilities convey and treat the wastewater from its member communities of Chisholm, Buhl, Kinney and the Town of Great Scott prior to discharge into the Lake Superior Basin via the St. Louis River.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In September 2011, the CIRSSD was awarded a $3,036,133 Wastewater Infrastructure Fund Grant for the Construction of the District's sewage conveyance system.

In July 2012, the CIRSSD was awarded a $9,000,000 Wastewater Infrastructure Fund Grant for the construction of the District's Wastewater Treatment Facility.

Project Contact Person

Norman L. Miranda
Executive Director
218-326-9930
nmiranda@hrgreen.com

($ in thousands)

CIRSSD Mercury Treatment

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,250	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$42	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$2,250	$0	$0
	$0			
TOTAL	**$42**	**$4,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$42	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$254	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$70	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,176	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$42**	**$4,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

CIRSSD Inflow/Infiltration Reduction

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,700
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	Request $4.7 million for the identification and elimination of Inflow and Infiltration from the Central Iron Range Sanitary Sewer District member communities.

Project Description

The CIRSSD was formed not only to provide member communities with wastewater conveyance and treatment, but also as a resource to resolve issues and fund projects which affect the entire District. As such, the District procured sewage flow meters, installed them in the Chisholm collection system and commissioned a study to identify the worst sources of I&I. The project identified a very significant source of I&I in the Lakeview Addition which is adjacent to Longyear lake in Chisholm. The City has adopted and authorized forwarding of the Lakeview Addition Facility Plan to MPCA for review and comment. MPCA approved the Facility Plan on June 22, 2015. The City has also requested and is listed on the MPCA Project Priority List Ranked 47th with 66 Priority Points as well as the 2016 Intended Use Plan. This seven-part project to resolve the Lakeview Addition sewer issues is $4,220,000.00 of this funding request. The remaining $580,000 will be used for smoke testing and system televising in Buhl and Kinney to identify and eliminate significant sources of I&I.

In addition to this request the CIRSSD intends to apply to the Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board for additional funding. The District and the City of Chisholm have spent considerable funds on the flow monitoring equipment, flow study and the development of the Facility Plan.

Project Rationale

Excessive infiltration and inflow (I&I) of clear water into the CIRSSD conveyance and treatment facilities results in high operation and maintenance costs for power, chemicals and unnecessary wear and tear on equipment. Deteriorating pipes and manholes are crumbling and contributing rocks and bricks which are lodging in pumps and prematurely destroying them. Pipes in the worse condition are in jeopardy of collapse especially in sensitive areas such as around Longyear Lake in Chisholm. In significant rain events, instantaneous peak flows reach the capacity of the new CIRSSD Buhl Lift Station.

Implementation of this project will significantly reduce (I&I) thus reduce O&M costs. Replacement of deteriorated manholes and pipes will avert eventual pipe failure resulting in backups, overflows and potential surface discharge to Longyear Lake.

Other Considerations

The CIRSSD has committed to $8,120,363.00 in State Revolving Fund Loans for the construction of the District's conveyance and treatment facilities recently commissioned in 2014. In addition, as a requirement of the District's NPDES/SDS Permit, the District committed to an additional $600,000.00 in State Revolving Fund Loan for the mandated demolition of the decommissioned Chisholm and Buhl Wastewater Treatment facilities prior to 12/31/14. Without additional financial assistance, the District, member communities and their citizenry could add an additional $2,250,000 in long-term debt.

The City of Chisholm pays 80% of this debt service through their portion of monthly payments to the District. As such, financing a program to provide significant replacement or rehabilitation to their sewage collection system is very limited.

In the past, the City of Chisholm was under an MPCA imposed moratorium which put strict limits on connections to their collection system. The City, over the past 7-years has made significant strides toward eliminating I&I through their street replacement projects and other spot repair efforts without significant financial assistance. However, at this point, assistance is required in order to finance the more expensive and critical projects such as the Lakeview Addition Project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will operate the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

Collection system conveys wastewater from the City of Chisholm to the CIRSSD's Chisholm Lift Station. Elimination of I&I will decrease the amount of clear water being conveyed, pumped and treated, thus reducing O&M costs. Reduction of flows will reduce the potential for sewer backups and overflows.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Norman L. Miranda
Executive Director
218-326-9930
nmiranda@hrgreen.com

($ in thousands)

CIRSSD Inflow/Infiltration Reduction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$4,700	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$65	$0	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$55	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$100	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$120**	**$6,800**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$120	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$267	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$156	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,377	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$120**	**$4,800**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Chatfield Economic Development Authority — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II	1	GO	$ 7,985	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 7,985	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 7,985	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$7,985
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$7.985 million in state funds is requested to complete Phase II renovations to the land and buildings known collectively as the Chatfield Center for the Arts, which is located in Chatfield, Minnesota. The result of this funding will be the completion of the rehabilitation of the 1916 former high school building, the 1936 auditorium building, the structure that links the two buildings, landscaping, etc. All of the spaces within the buildings will then be modernized and the full potential of the Center can be realized.

Project Description

In 2014, the Minnesota Legislature appropriated partial funding in the amount of $5,352,000 to the Chatfield Economic Development Authority to predesign, design, renovate, furnish, and equip improvements to the Chatfield Center for the Arts project, which generally included the renovation of Potter Auditorium, the installation of an elevator, and improvements to the mechanical and electrical systems, along with other amenity improvements. Since the Legislature realized that the 2014 allocation was not adequate to address all of the needs, the Chatfield EDA was invited to make a supplemental application for the balance of the funding needed, which is estimated to be $7,900,000.

The Phase II project scope generally consists of demolition and new construction of the existing link between Potter Auditorium and the 1916 building, demolition of a small garage facility on the premises that is not original to the property nor functional any longer, renovations to the 1916 school building, restoration of the 1916 school building skylights, add/improve restroom facilities throughout facility, landscaping, improvements to parking areas, mechanical/electrical/HVAC and other building systems improvements, and repairs to the north façade of the 1916 school building.

The total cost for Phase II renovations, including associated professional fees and contingencies, are estimated at $7.9 million.

Total square feet of current facilities: 40,863

Total square feet to be renovated: 15,139

Total square feet to be added to existing facilities: 3,071

Project Rationale

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

- To create a regional arts center that will not only benefit the residents of Chatfield, but Southeast Minnesota as well
- To restore the Potter Auditorium while preserving and enhancing its historical value
- To create space in a regionally central location, for community events and gatherings such as theater, music, weddings, concerts, conferences
- To create a catalyst for business and economic development in the region
- Create a venue capable of hosting productions and crowds of regional significance
- Nurturing individuals, creating a sustainable community, maintaining a strong regional employee base and enhancing the livability of Southeast Minnesota.

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

Other Considerations

None.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A.

Who will own the facility?

The Chatfield Economic Development Authority

Who will operate the facility?

The Chatfield Economic Development Authority, either directly or indirectly via a lease arrangement with a management firm.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Private use of the space is expected to be limited to short term such as conferences, workshops, parties, etc.

Public Purpose

Economic and Community Development; Heritage Preservation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

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

At the time of this writing, Pre-Design has been completed for Phase I and II, Schematic Design for Phase I and II is nearly complete.

Project Contact Person

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

($ in thousands)

Chatfield Center for the Arts Phase II

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$5,352	$7,985	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$10	$0	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$40	$0	$0	$0
City Funds	$8,145	$0	$0	$0
County Funds	$3	$0	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$449	$0	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$290	$0	$0	$0
Other Funding	$2	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$0	$0	$5,000
TOTAL	**$14,291**	**$7,985**	**$0**	**$5,000**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$7,895	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$44	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$514	$502	$0	$0
Project Management	$187	$387	$0	$0
Construction	$5,071	$5,714	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$580	$542	$0	$5,000
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$840	$0	$804
TOTAL	**$14,291**	**$7,985**	**$0**	**$5,804**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Yes
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Chisago County Public Safety Center - Phase II	1	GO	$ 12,000	$ 0	$ 0
Chisago County US Highway 8 - CSAH 26 Traffic Control System	2	GO	$ 1,250	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 13,250	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 13,250	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Chisago County Public Safety Center - Phase II

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$12,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Construction of Phase II of Chisago County's Public Safety Center - a new $24 million County Jail/Law Enforcement Center and piloting of innovative jail facilities, operations and programming, in partnership with leading service providers, including the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, to address increased incidence of inmates suffering from significant behavioral health and addiction-related issues, especially those with co-occurring mental health disorders.

Project Description

Built in 1974, the existing Chisago County Jail and Law Enforcement (LEC) facilities are both functionally and structurally obsolete and inadequately sized and configured for appropriate current and future programming and operations. Despite a 1994 expansion of minimum security facilities, this now-landlocked 67-bed jail suffers from outdated cell block-style construction, aging and failing infrastructure (foundation and erosion, HVAC systems, electrical, plumbing, roofing, etc.), poor and dangerous design (hallways, doors/locks, sally port, intake, medical facilities, staff offices), and inadequate space for required programming, recreation, visitation, counseling, and rehabilitative/treatment services.

A 2004 waiver from the State of Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) for eight (8) additional beds provided temporary relief from overcrowding while a new jail and law enforcement center was studied and planned. Chisago County undertook a major effort to construct a new integrated Public Safety Center, purchased land ($1.131 million), installed necessary infrastructure ($1.841 million), and constructed a new $2.035 million Emergency Communications Center (Phase I of the larger Public Safety Center). However, plans for Phase II - a new 240-bed jail and law enforcement center - were tabled, due to the lasting impact on Chisago County from the 2007-12 great recession and a major drop in crime and incarceration rates.

Despite austere budgeting and reduced County operations and personnel, Chisago County's foreseeable economic and tax capacity outlook continues to be limited by a near-non-existent post-recession recovery, its adjacency to Wisconsin and greater MSP area economic competitors, and the State of Minnesota's current taxing structure. According to the Office of the State Auditor, the County has one of the lowest taxable tax capacities in the State (70 of 87 counties) while one of the lowest per capita levies in the State (34 of 87 counties).

Unfortunately, lingering debt obligations for past investments in local roads and bridges (70%), public facilities (10%), public safety communications/ARMER (9%) and economic development (7%) limit the County’s ability to issue significant new debt, leaving the County with the 3rd highest per capita debt

service in the State.

With no regional jail facilities available, the closest neighboring facility 30 miles away, and an effective capacity of only 40-45 of the 67 available beds (due to inmate classification and facility block configuration), Chisago County has seen its daily out-of-county placement rates increase significantly, costing the county approximately $ 440,000 in 2014 and projected to exceed $500,000 in 2015. DOC sanctions are now imminent due to facility overcrowding, lack of programming and activity space, and infrastructure issues related to facility function, security and operations, with the County sentenced to lose its 8 additional beds and see its classification reduced from a Class III Jail to a Class II 90-day Lockup (if not to a Class I 72-hour Holding facility).

In constructing and operating its new 120-bed jail and law enforcement center, an opportunity exists to pilot and demonstrate to the State and nation an innovative jail and law enforcement center. In partnership with leading service providers, including the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, the County's Health and Human Services Department, and State of Minnesota agencies, Chisago County's will undertake the first-ever comprehensive planning, design, construction and operation of a county jail facility specifically to address increased incidence of inmates suffering from significant behavioral health and addiction-related diagnoses, especially those diagnosed with co-occurring mental health disorders. This population is currently estimated at well over 50% of the typical inmate population and is expected to increase even more so in the future.

The Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation is a world-renown force of healing and hope for individuals, families and communities affected by addiction to alcohol and other drugs and co-occurring mental health disorders. It is the nation's largest nonprofit treatment provider, with a legacy that began in 1949 and includes the 1982 founding of the Betty Ford Center. With 16 sites in nine states, the Foundation offers prevention and recovery solutions nationwide and across the entire continuum of care to help youth and adults reclaim their lives from the disease of addiction. It includes the largest recovery publishing house in the country, a fully accredited graduate school of addiction studies, an addiction research center, an education arm for medical professionals and a unique children's program, and is the nation's leader in advocacy and policy for treatment and recovery.

In consultation with its partners, the county will complete an innovative facility design of jail pods of approximately 12 beds for intensive management of inmates with serious and persistent behavioral and mental health diagnoses, including active and passive monitoring and utilization of specialized materials and construction techniques. Other pods will be utilized, as needed for additional inmates requiring behavioral health services.

Additional collaboration and partnerships efforts will focus on jail operations, inmate services and programming, to include utilization of world-class diagnostic assessments and treatment protocols and curricula. The jail's unique location only 2 miles from Hazelden's corporate campus and Center City, MN treatment facilities also affords a unique opportunity for integrated treatment services, including perhaps through the Hazelden Betty Ford Graduate School of Addiction Studies, specialized services, and/or contracted individualized treatment (via MN Sure or private insurance).

Project Rationale

Chisago County is requesting $12,000,000 of state funding to match the same amount of funding, or more, from Chisago County to construct Phase II of its Public Safety Center - a new, county jail and law enforcement center to replace its existing outdated, undersized and obsolete facility. Replacement of the facility is needed to address current structural, capacity and operational deficiencies and ensure public safety and employee and inmate health, safety and welfare for years to come. In partnership with leading service providers, including the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, Chisago County's innovative new jail and law enforcement center will pilot for the State of Minnesota and nation facility design, operations and programming to address increased incidence of inmates suffering from significant behavioral health and addiction-related diagnoses, especially those diagnosed with co-occurring mental health disorders.

Other Considerations

Chisago County has undertaken a major effort to construct a new integrated Public Safety Center, including purchase of land ($1.131 million), installation of necessary infrastructure ($1.841 million), and construction of a new $2.035 million Emergency Communications Center (Phase I of the larger Public Safety Center).

State bonding for county jail facilities is authorized and appropriate, especially given the Legislature's 2014 repeal of M.S. 241.022.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Chisago County, MN

Who will operate the facility?

Chisago County, MN

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

Public Safety/Law Enforcement/Renewable Energy (Solar)/Public Health (Mental Illness)

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous State bonding appropriations. Chisago County has received state and MESB grants/funding for construct of certain ARMER and public safety communications equipment upgrades co-located with and integrated into Phase I (Emergency Communications Center) of its new Public

Safety Center.

Project Contact Person

Bruce A. Messelt
County Administrator
651-213-8879
bruce.messelt@chisagocounty.us

($ in thousands)

Chisago County Public Safety Center - Phase II

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$12,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$5,668	$0	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$413	$0	$0	$0
Other Funding	$54	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$12,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$6,135**	**$24,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$1,131	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$863	$1,482	$0	$0
Project Management	$52	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$3,876	$20,760	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$213	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$1,573	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$185	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$6,135**	**$24,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Chisago County US Highway 8 - CSAH 26 Traffic Control System

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,250
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	Installation of traffic control system (traffic control signals or roundabout) at intersection of U.S. Highway 8 and Chisago County State Aid Highway 26 (Pleasant Valley Road) to address dangerous conditions and facilitate critical traffic safety improvements. Estimated project cost of $2.5M.

Project Description

Chisago County, MN, in coordination with the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, is requesting state bond funding of $1.25 million to match local funding by Chisago County of at least $1.25 million to install a critically-needed traffic control system at the intersection of U.S. Highway 8 and Chisago County State Aid Highway 26 (Pleasant Valley Road), located in Center City, MN.

This project has been denoted as one of the most dangerous intersections in the County, and perhaps in the State of Minnesota. High speed t-bone collisions are common and have resulted in severe injury and death. Location of the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation Corporate Headquarters and major Treatment Center at this intersection brings with it major client and employee traffic, many of whom are unfamiliar with the area and the dangerous intersection.

U.S. Highway 8 also carries major tourism traffic visiting Interstate Park (Minnesota's busiest State Park), Wild River State Park, and other destinations. Traffic count projections only show significant increase in future ADTs.

The intersection is currently controlled by a two-way, flashing stop sign system and rumble strips on Pleasant Valley Road. Poor sight lines and major elevation changes at the intersection add to dangerous conditions. Recent minor intersection improvements undertaken by MNDOT have only modestly improved safety conditions.

Project Rationale

Chisago County, MN, in coordination with the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation, is requesting state bond funding of $1.25 million to match local funding by Chisago County of at least $1.25 million to install a critically-needed traffic control system at the intersection of U.S. Highway 8 and Chisago County State Aid Highway 26 (Pleasant Valley Road), located in Center City, MN.

This project has been denoted as one of the most dangerous intersections in the County, and perhaps in the State of Minnesota. High speed t-bone collisions are common and have resulted in severe injury and death.

The current two-way stop sign system and rumble strips, along with poor sight lines and elevations, need to be improved to a full 4-way traffic control system (traffic signals or roundabout) and possibly accommodated by slower speeds on U.S. Highway 8.

Based upon current project cost estimates, requested is matching State bond funding of $1.25 million of a projected $2.5 million cost.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

MNDOT

Who will operate the facility?

MNDOT

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Public Safety/Public Transportation

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Bruce A. Messelt
County Administrator
651-213-8879
bruce.messelt@chisagocounty.us

($ in thousands)

Chisago County US Highway 8 - CSAH 26 Traffic Control System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,250	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$1,250	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$50	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$125	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$450	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$125	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,750	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Chisholm, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
New Municipal Building	1	GO	$ 2,650	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,650	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,650	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

New Municipal Building

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,650
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $2,650,000 in State Bond Funding to construct a New City Hall, Fire, Police, and Community Center facility to be located in the Northwest quadrant of the Trunk Highway 169/County State and Highway 67 intersection in the Southeast portion of Chisholm. The proposed building site is a 6.5 acre tract in the newly platted 2nd Addition to the Chisholm Industrial Park. This facility is expected to spur development of the remainder of the approximate 50 acre plat in the next few years.

Project Description

Being proposed is an estimated 30,000 square foot, $5.3 million combination City Hall, Fire, Police, and Community Center facility located on a newly platted 6.5 acre site in the City owned Chisholm Industrial Park-2nd Addition. The site is located at the junction of TH 169 and CSAH 67 and serves as a gateway into Chisholm at its' southeast corner. An architectural firm has been retained to conduct a pre-design of the proposed facility including a space-needs analysis and an alternative site evaluation. Preliminary space and design concepts suggest the following: 15,000 square feet, 34' high Fire department segment located at one end of the facility to accommodate future expansion, if needed, and constructed of pre-cast, pre-stressed tip-up concrete panels. Adjacent to the Fire Hall would be a 2-story, 20' high, 5,000 square foot (each story) segment housing the Police station on the lower level and Administrative offices on the 2nd story. Building construction of this segment is envisioned to be structural steel framing with a brick facade. The Community Center would be situated adjacent to the Police/City Hall segment and at the opposite end of the building complex as the Fire Hall. The Community Center is envisioned as a 1-story 12' high, 5,000 square foot area with the same construction as the Police/City Hall segment. Funding of the new facility, as will be detailed in the project financing section of this application, will be through the City's General Tax Levy as well as grants sought through the IRRRB and the State's Bond Grant.

Project Rationale

Chisholm City Hall was constructed in 1923 with a building foot print of 6,768 square feet. Although the City Hall is well-maintained, it is no longer energy efficient, is difficult and expensive to heat and cool and is in need of electrical upgrades to serve current technologies. Additionally the building's physical layout is not conducive to efficient and economical staffing and operation and lacks meeting/conference rooms. Although handicap accessibility is provided to the main floor administrative offices, there is no such accessibility to the basement and 2nd floor levels of City Hall. The City is also in negotiations with several private parties to convert this "historically significant" building into office/retail and/or affordable housing units. The City Fire Hall and Police Station are in a single 2 story building located across the street and down the block from City Hall. The building was constructed in 1914 with the Fire department housed at street level in approximately 3,600 sq ft of space with only two (2) overhead doors for truck and equipment access via main street (TH 73). This

extremely undersized space is limiting the quantity and size of the trucks and equipment needed to serve the community and the surrounding townships. Furthermore, the facility lacks meeting, training and conference rooms and has only a single unisex bathroom without shower facilities. The building is not energy efficient, lacks uniform heating and cooling throughout the space, lacks a hose tower and is in mmediate need of mechanical and electrical system upgrades. The Police department is housed on the 2nd floor above the Fire Hall in approximately 2,200 sq ft of space. The Police department space is extremely undersized with minimal or no space for administrative offices, squad, conference, evidence rooms and records/file storage. In addition, there is no provisions for handicap accessibility to this 2nd story level via either ramp or elevator. Again, the existing heating, ventilation, and air conditioning do not provide a consistent and uniform environment within the work space. Lighting (both natural and electrical) is fair to poor and major upgrades are needed for the plumbing and electrical systems. Currently the building is landlocked by development, streets, and/or alleys on all four sides. The vehicle impound lot, police vehicle storage, file & evidence storage are accommodated off-site resulting in inefficient operations. The City of Chisholm does not have a Community Center and City Hall does not have the space or facilities to accommodate the functions of various community and civic groups.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars will be requested for this project. All operating costs of the new facility will be the responsibility of the City of Chisholm.

Who will own the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will operate the facility?

City of Chisholm

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

The proposed City Hall, Fire, Police, and Community Center facility is an effort by the City of Chisholm to consolidate City services for its residents and constituents at a single site. Doing so will provide greater efficiency and access for the public while providing better operational efficiencies for the staff of each department. The additional space for the City Administrative offices as well as the Police and Fire departments will enable each unit to consolidate their operations. The new facilities will also provide much needed upgrades to the plumbing, heating, air conditioning, ventilation, electrical, insulation, and lighting systems which will result in lower operational and maintenance costs while improving staff morale and performance. The Community Center will finally provide community organizations and civic groups, including Senior Citizens a pleasant, functional, convenient, economical, and accessible facility in which to meet.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Ms. Susan Schweiss
Interim City Clerk-Treasurer/Administrator
218-254-7900
sschweiss@ci.chisholm.mn.us

($ in thousands)

New Municipal Building

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,650	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$2,150	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$5,300**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,300	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$5,300**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Clay County — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Clay County Jail	1	GO	$ 15,054	$ 0	$ 0
Clay County Resource Recovery Campus	2	GO	$ 8,500	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 23,554	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 23,554	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Clay County Jail

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$15,054
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$15 million in State funds is requested for the design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a new 188 bed jail for the Clay County, in Moorhead.

Project Description

Scope: The jail is part of the "Essential Services" pieces of the County's infrastructure. Predesign began in 2008, by the hiring of Klein McCarthy and Co. LTD., Architects. A schematic design was presented to in 2009.

Several moderate and small remodeling projects were completed in attempt to extend the service life of the jail since 2009.

Predesign has been slightly modified beginning of 2015. Final scope of the project is to construct a free-standing new jail located adjacent to the existing jail, which will be vacated and demolished upon occupying the new jail and after construction of a new Law Enforcement Center. The new MN DOC – compliant jail will be a Class III facility as defined by the Minnesota Department of Corrections, Rules Governing Adult Detention Facilities, 2911.0200, Subpart 13 which states "Class III facility means a secure detention facility used to confine sentenced inmates for a time not to exceed any limits set by Minnesota Statues, adult pretrial and pre-sentenced detainees indefinitely, and juveniles up to the limits set by Minnesota Statutes and commissioner approval. A Class III facility shall also be known as a jail facility." The jail facility will be under direct authority of the Sheriff of Clay County, who by the Minnesota Statute is responsible for the managing of the Jail and he has hired a full-time Jail Administrator to manage the day-to-day operations.

The new Jail will be 146 to 150 beds of hard cells, most of which will be double-bunked. A combination of single and double-bunked cells for offenders based on their inmate classification.

The Jail has been planned for expansion to reach a capacity of not less than 200 beds. A 60-bed external expansion pod area is planned on the site. Vertical expansion option, for a 120-bed Level 3 and 4 was designed in the full program scope. Vertical expansion cost factors are significant in jail construction, and may prove to be cost prohibitive to include in a base scope optional design. The horizontal expansion area may be considered for future floors above. These decisions will be made in the design development phase.

Costs: Construction costs of the new jail include $24,702,785 in actual construction, $2,876,035 in soft costs, including construction development and furniture, fixtures and equipment for a total of $27,578,820.

Funding: Funding of the new jail incorporates general levy and wind energy tax revenues.

Project Rationale

Clay County prides itself on providing a safe community and living environment for its residents. Public Safety requires a facility to secure offenders that is safe, humane and conforms to the standards established by the Minnesota Department of Corrections.

Clay County borders Cass County, North Dakota on its western side and is part of the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area. Clay County's population of 60,426 ranks it 16th in the State. The two-county Fargo-Moorhead area has an overall population of over 228,000 residents.

Built in 1966, the Clay County Jail is the oldest jail in the State and has far exceeded its life expectancy. Due to state mandated changes in cell size, classification and other building requirements, the jail has lost 6 of the original 96 beds available. Additionally, 22 of these remaining 90 beds are non-compliant and as a result, the jail has been operating under a variance by the Minnesota Department of Corrections since 2013.

Limited to a 75% operational capacity, the jail houses an average of 30 inmates at other facilities incurring a cost of over $545,000 per year.

Although the Red River of the North provides a distinct boundary between the two States, criminal activity is indifferent to such boundaries. On average, 30 % of Clay County Jail inmates are North Dakota residents. This percentage continues to rise as a result of the recent Bakken Formation oil boom in North Dakota and the rising criminal behavior and enterprises that develop along with such population increases.

The jail has not met minimum space requirements since 1978. Beginning in 1995, significant repairs and replacement to critical infrastructure including plumbing, roof and HVAC were completed to extend the life of the jail. Short term remodeling took place in 1998 followed by a needs analysis and future long term planning. Even with repairs and remodeling, the jail has significant issues associated with a 50 year old building that include cracked concrete floors, an over extended electrical system and severe plumbing issues that leak waste and gray water contaminants to the Law Enforcement office space below.

After comprehensive planning and pre-design, a schematic design report was completed by Klein McCarthy and Co. Ltd in 2009 for the construction of a new jail. Considering the current population of the county, as well as the service area of the entire Fargo-Moorhead metro area, a 188 bed jail is required to fulfill the needs today and into the future.

The age and outdated design of the jail, coupled with the substantial population increase over the last several decades, has rendered the jail grossly insufficient and it is well beyond its useful life. Clay County is committed to constructing a new jail as evident in the Board Resolution and expenditures for a design.

Other Considerations

Clay County has been studing building a new jail for some time. This is not a new topic, nor has the County rushed to construction phase without due deligence in study, predesign and thought.

To date, the County as expended $81,788 for a jail study, and $168,997 in predesign.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Clay County is requesting $15 million dollars in State operating dollars to particially fund a county

jail, in order to comply with Department of Corrections standards.

Who will own the facility?

Clay County

Who will operate the facility?

Clay County

Who will use or occupy this space?

The facility will be owned, operated and soley occupied by Clay County.

Public Purpose

To provide a safe and secure facility for inmate incarceration according to the standards established by the Minnesota Department of Corrections.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Brian Berg
County Administrator
218-299-7333
brian.berg@co.clay.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Clay County Jail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$15,054	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$402	$310	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$15,055	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$402**	**$30,419**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$123	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$26,714	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$741	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$3,243	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$30,821**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Clay County Resource Recovery Campus

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,500
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	This project is Phase II of a solid waste management project which received legislative funding for Phase I during the 2015 legislative session Phase I funding is for final design. We are seeking funding for Phase II which will construct a new Resource Recovery Campus consisting of a new Solid Waste Transfer Stations, Problem Materials Facility and a single sort Material Recovery Facility (MRF).

Project Description

Clay County's project will construct and co-locate a transfer station and a problem materials facility as well as construct the only single-sort MRF in West Central Minnesota. By doing so, Clay County will meet MPCA and Clay County solid waste management goals by increasing the amount of material recycled in the region..

Currently Clay County utilizes a transfer station which is over 40 years old which is not compatible with the Prairie Lake Incinerator. This project will eliminate the existing deadheading of solid waste between the transfer station, Prairie Lakes Incinerator, and Clay County Landfill. This dead heading is highly inefficient and results in higher costs. The current Clay County Household Hazardous Waste Facility is also over 40 years old. Both of these facilities are in need of extensive and costly repairs. Additionally, the electronics collection facility is located in an old bus barn located 5 miles from the transfer station and household hazardous waste facility. Clay County is a growing community and all of these facilities are undersized and can't adequately handle the amount of solid waste and hazardous material generated. Finally, due to the extensive costs to upgrade the existing facilities make constructing new facilities a more viable option. Also, renovating existing facilities will still result in facilities that are geographically separated. Co-location of these facilities will optimize operations and provide improved customer service resulting in increased participation in recycling.

Project Rationale

The Resource Recovery Campus will allow Clay County and the City of Moorhead to meet three goals. First, it will replace a 40-year old transfer station and household hazardous waste facility and co-locate all solid waste functions improving customer service. Secondly, the new recovery campus will enable Clay County to participate in a regional solid waste management system. Third, the single sort MRF will significantly increase regional participation in recycling diverting more material from the Clay County Landfill.

Other Considerations

To further State of Minnesota's goals, Clay County joined the Prairie Lakes Solid Waste Authority. Prairie Lakes is composed of Becker, Otter Tail, Wadena, Todd, and Clay Counties. As part of the

agreement Clay County is obligated to take 9400 t/y of mixed municipal solid waster to Perham for processing and incineration. Clay County agreed to take up to 11,000 t/y of fines at our landfill. Initially it was hoped that the same containers could be used to transport this material. Unfortunately the loadouts at the facilities are incompatible resulting in containers from both facilities are being deadheaded. Implementation of this project will make the regional system more efficient and economical.

The City of Moorhead has approximately 5,000 multi-family households which are unable to participate in the current curbside recycling program.. The new single sort MRF will allow these household to participate in curbside recycling, which will increase Moorhead's household recycling participation rate by 50%. Other counties that have implemented a single sort material recovery facility have also significantly increased the volume of material recovered and number of people who recycle. Clay County expects the same result. Funding for this project will ensure Clay County continues to meet their own solid waste goals, as well as state goals, as directed by the MPCA.

Clay County spent $40,000 on a feasibility study that was completed January 2015. Additionally, Clay County spent $20,000 on a Phase II environmental assessment on the preliminary site location.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Assistance from the state will help minimized any increased costs.Clay County is moving from a volume based fee to a weight based fee next year. During this transition, all disposal costs as well as the service fees all Clay County homes and businesses pay will be analyzed

Who will own the facility?

Clay County

Who will operate the facility?

Clay County

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Meet requirements mandated by the State's Waste Management Act. Provides Clay County the opportunity to minimize the amount of material landfilled by enabling the county to participate in a regional solid waste management system.

Description of Previous Appropriations

During the 2015 special legislative session, Clay County received a matching grant of $600,000 from the legislature for funding Phase I of this project. The money will be used for final design of the project.

Project Contact Person

Kirk Rosenberger/Steve Moore
Solid Waste Director/Public Works Director
218-299-7332
kirk.rosenberger@co.clay.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Clay County Resource Recovery Campus

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$600	$8,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$600	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$1,200**	**$8,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$150	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$22	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$101	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$6,791	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$500	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$936	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

Cold Spring, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements	1	GO	$ 8,300	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 8,300	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 8,300	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,300
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The City of Cold Spring is applying for up to 8.3 million in State Funds to fund the 2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements. The project includes: Source- The replacement and/or augmentation of potable wells 4, 5 and 6 and the construction of new wells and new well pump houses at an estimated cost of $841,000. Treatment- The proposed construction of two water treatment plants to treat nitrates, and iron/manganese at an estimated cost of $5,705,000. Distribution- The proposed construction of raw water mains from the existing and new wells to the new water treatment plants and distribution system at an estimated cost of $1,771,000.

Project Description

The first step for the City of Cold Spring will be to locate a viable water source as part of the overall project. A viable water source will be one that provides adequate volume, rate and quality. Once an analysis of the water has been completed a decision can be made as to the type of treatment that will be required.

If the water analysis requires both nitrate and iron/manganese treatment, project costs could reach $8.3 million.

The City of Cold Spring has looked at a number of sources for funding this project. They are:

- Rural Development, Stearns Electric
- Rural Development Loan and Grant Program
- Minnesota Public Facilities Authority, Drinking Water Revolving Fund

City is currently on the 2015 Intended Use Plan and has submitted to be included on the 2016 intended Use Plan. Department of Employment and Economic Development, State of Minnesota Capital Bonding Process, Special Legislation, City Water Fund, City Bonding Authority.

Project Rationale

The City of Cold Spring is facing a significant reduction in water supply and impacts on both residential and commercial users because of the legislation that was passed in the 2010 legislative session to protect trout streams. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has determined that the proximity of the wells being used by the Cold Spring Brewery, and at least City wells 4, 5, and 6 have an influence on the trout stream that runs adjacent to the Cold Spring Brewery. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources has determined because of this influence to the trout stream the Cold Spring Brewery wells must be closed and that City wells 4, 5, and 6 may continue

only at the present rate and capacity thus limiting their ability to meet future City needs. The only viable water source for the Cold Spring Brewery will be the City. The Cold Spring Brewery water needs will equal approximately fifty percent of the City's current water production.

The City of Cold Spring will not only have to substantially increase water production to meet the Cold Spring Brewery needs, but because of the heavy use of ground water irrigation for agricultural purposes it is expected the levels of nitrates in the ground water will continue to rise. This increase in nitrates in the ground water and the presence of high levels of iron and manganese may require the construction of two new water treatment plants. One water treatment plant will remove iron and manganese the other to remove nitrates from the potable water.

Other Considerations

The City of Cold Spring believes that if it were not for the legislation passed by the Legislature in 2010 regarding the protection of trout streams, and the determination by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources that the Cold Spring Brewery closes their wells along with the limitations place on City wells 4 5, and 6, the City would not be considering these improvements at this time and would not be making this request.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There will be an impact on the City's Water Operating Fund because of the increase in operating expenses to operate the new water treatment plants and pay for loans or bonds that are used to pay for the water infrastructure improvements that are not covered by State bond funds or other revenue. sources.

Who will own the facility?

City of Cold Spring

Who will operate the facility?

City of Cold Spring

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Production, conveyance and treatment of potable water for the City of Cold Spring.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City of Cold Spring is currently on the Minnesota Public Facilities Authority Drinking Water Revolving Fund 2015 Intended Use Plan. The City has also made application to the Public Facilities Authority Drinking Water Revolving Fund to be placed on the 2016 Intended Use Plan. The City of Cold Spring's median household income currently exceeds agency limits to qualify for principal forgiveness, therefore any money received from the PFA will be repaid in it's entirety.

Project Contact Person

Kris Dockendorf
Acting City Administrator
320-685-3653
kdockendorf@coldspring.govoffice.com

($ in thousands)

2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$8,300	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,300**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$111	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,068	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$7,121	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$827	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$9,127**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Construction of County State Aid Highway 42 Interchange at Trunk Highway 52, Rosemount	1	GO	$ 5,500	$ 0	$ 0
Powerhouse and Turbine Upgrade, Byllesby Dam	2	GO	$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
Mississippi River Regional Trail, Rosemount East Segment	3	GO	$ 2,500	$ 0	$ 0
Big Rivers Regional Trail Trailhead	4	GO	$ 787	$ 0	$ 0
Minnesota River Regional Trail, Eagan Segment	5	GO	$ 2,500	$ 0	$ 0
East/West Transit Improvements	6	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Fiber Linking Public Facilities Across Dakota County	7	GO	$ 1,450	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 20,737	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 20,737	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Construction of County State Aid Highway 42 Interchange at Trunk Highway 52, Rosemount

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$5,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $5,500,000 in State bond funding to construct the first stage of a future system interchange reconstruction project developed in cooperation with the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the City of Rosemount.

Project Description

This project includes reconstruction of County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 42, a principal arterial, to create a four-lane divided combination urban / rural roadway section. The project also replaces two Trunk Highway 52 mainline bridges over CSAH 42 and reconstructs the freeway access ramps. Protected turn lanes will be included on CSAH 42 at all intersections with ramps and designated local roads, as well as at intersections with major driveways.

Currently, CSAH 42 transitions from a four-lane highway to a two-lane highway west of the interchange with TH 52, with one of the eastbound travel lanes dropping into a turn lane near the interchange. This project will extend the four-lane section of CSAH 42 past the interchange to remove the lane drops and transitions at the interchange. In addition, protected turn lanes will be added for all turning movements at the interchange. These improvements will reduce conflict points and allow for safer turning movements at the interchange.

This project has a total cost of $16.8 million, and is a partnership between the County, MnDOT, and the City of Rosemount (although Rosemount is the only financial partner). Federal Highway Administration funds have also been committed to this project, including $7 million awarded through the regional solicitation process for FY 2017.

Project Rationale

TH 52 is a High Priority Interregional Corridor connecting Rochester to the Twin Cities, and this segment of CSAH 42 is the only east/west principal arterial route south of I-494 and east of I-35. Despite CSAH 42 being under county jurisdiction, the interchange is an important connection between two principal arterial routes in the regional transportation system.

Projected growth and immediate safety concerns drive the demand for this project. The existing interchange has limited visibility along CSAH 42, and has been the site of a number of severe and fatal crashes over the past few years. Furthermore, it is projected that the population of the City of Rosemount will more than double by 2030, meaning demands on this intersection will only increase.

Other Considerations

n/a

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The County is adding approximately 2 lane miles to CSAH 42, and will be responsible for future operating costs associated with this expansion. MnDOT is not adding any lane miles, so there are no increased operating costs expected in the future.

Who will own the facility?

CSAH Road 42 is owned by Dakota County. MnDOT owns TH 52 and the bridges along the route.

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County will operate CSAH 42 and MnDOT will operate TH 52 and the bridges.

Who will use or occupy this space?

None.

Public Purpose

Both CSAH 42 and TH 52 are principal arterials and provide key connections for residents across the metropolitan area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The County was awarded $7,280,000 through the regional solicitation process for this project. There is also $2,900,000 in federal funding available for design and right-of-way acquisition.

Project Contact Person

Steve Mielke
Physical Development Director, Dakota County
952-891-7007
steve.mielke@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Construction of County State Aid Highway 42 Interchange at Trunk Highway 52, Rosemount

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$5,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$2,900	$7,000	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$614	$0	$0
County Funds	$0	$786	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$2,900**	**$13,900**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$2,700	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,041	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$13,059	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,283	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$19,083**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Powerhouse and Turbine Upgrade, Byllesby Dam

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	This request is for $6,000,000 to fund turbine and powerhouse improvements to the Byllesby Dam, a hydroelectric generating facility in Cannon Falls.

Project Description

The Byllesby Dam is located on the Cannon River on the boundary of Dakota and Goodhue Counties, approximately one mile upstream from the City of Cannon Falls. While the Dam is located on the boundary of Dakota and Goodhue Counties, water flows into the reservoir (Lake Byllesby) from eight upstream counties. As the sole owner, Dakota County is responsible for all Dam safety related issues. The Dam (and hydro-electric generating facility) has been operated under an exemption from licensing issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) since 1986. The Dam is considered a high-hazard Dam due to its upstream proximity to the City of Cannon Falls.

This project will upgrade and enhance the electrical generating facilities at the Dam, for a total cost of $12,000,000. This project is solely under the jurisdiction of Dakota County; no other partners are involved in rehabilitation of the Dam.

Project Rationale

The three existing turbines within the Byllesby Dam hydro-electric generating facility have nearly reached their operational life. Dakota County has made significant capital investment in recent years to safely pass the Probable Maximum Flood through the installation of new gates and spillway as required by FERC and a multi-year Capital Improvement Project (CIP) for long-term maintenance and repair to the 103 year old dam. To help repay the costs associated with the FERC required spillway project and the multi-year CIP, in 2014 two studies were conducted to look at the electrical energy market and the feasibility of upgrading the aging turbines. The studies showed that a $12,000,000 turbine upgrade and powerhouse enhancement provided the best Return on Investment. A turbine upgrade and powerhouse enhancement will ensure that the Dam remains operational, enabling the County to pay back the costs associated with the above mentioned projects and further ensures continued use of a clean, renewable energy source for decades.

Other Considerations

n/a

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Operating costs for the Dam are currently budgeted by the County. There will be no impact on the State budget.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County

Who will use or occupy this space?

None.

Public Purpose

To provide recreational resources to the region through Lake Byllseby and to provide clean, renewable energy to the southern metro area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Steve Mielke
Physical Development Director, Dakota County
952-891-7007
steven.mielke@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Powerhouse and Turbine Upgrade, Byllesby Dam

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$3,000	$2,000	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,000**	**$2,000**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,250	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$7,750	$2,000	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,237	$247	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$11,237**	**$2,247**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Mississippi River Regional Trail, Rosemount East Segment

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,500
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	This request is for $2,500,000 in State bond funding to design and construct 1.7 miles of the Mississippi River Regional Trail (MRRT) within the City of Rosemount.

Project Description

The Rosemount East segment is the final unfunded segment of the 27 mile Mississippi River Regional Trail in Dakota County. The Mississippi River Trail Rosemount East project is a 1.7 mile bike and pedestrian trail segment that includes two grade separated crossing of Union Pacific Railroad facilities. When completed, the Mississippi River Regional Trail will connect from St Paul to Hastings, with additional connections funded to Downtown St. Paul and Prescott WI in 2017.

The project will construct a 10-foot wide bituminous trail in Rosemount parallel the Mississippi River, completing a gap that currently lacks safe non-motorized infrastructure. The project will include clearing, grading, landscaping, plantings, and two pedestrian tunnels of Union Pacific tracks. Over the past year Dakota County has been working with the Union Pacific Railroad on a design that provides grade separation of adjacent rail facilities.

The total cost of this project will be $6,515,000. Dakota County is solely responsible for this initiative.

Project Rationale

The trail will provide surface transportation infrastructure for non-motorized uses between Pine Bend Trail in Rosemount and Spring Lake Park Reserve. This will form a critical link for cyclists commuting between Hastings, Prescott, Nininger Township, Rosemount, Inver Grove Heights, South St. Paul and St. Paul. The corridor also contains employment throughout, including downtown St. Paul to the north, Hastings on the south and major industry and business parks in South St. Paul, Inver Grove Heights, and Rosemount along the way.

The trail will provide outstanding recreation opportunities by providing access to the Mississippi River and many destinations in the corridor. Destinations include the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, Spring Lake Regional Park Reserve, Pine Bend Bluffs Scientific and Natural Area, River to River Greenway, Rosemount Greenway (planned), Kaposia Landing (South St Paul park), MnDNR boat launch (South St Paul), Rock Island River Pier (Inver Grove), Heritage Village Park (Inver Grove Heights), historic downtown Hastings and many historic and cultural resources the length of the trail.

Other Considerations

n/a

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The County will increase its request for Operations and Maintenance appropriations in the future, depending on the final design of the greenway and the ongoing maintenance required.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County

Who will use or occupy this space?

n/a

Public Purpose

Regional Greenway for recreation, transportation, water quality and habitat protection.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Steve Mielke

Physical Development Division Director
952-891-7007
steven.mielke@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Mississippi River Regional Trail, Rosemount East Segment

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$4,015	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,515**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,165	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$450	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$438	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,462	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$885	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,400**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Big Rivers Regional Trail Trailhead

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$787
Priority Ranking:	4
Project Summary:	This request is for $787,500 in State bond funding to design and construct the Big Rivers Regional Trail (BRRT) trailhead and site improvements in Mendota Heights.

Project Description

This request would provide basic public services, such as: (1) an expanded parking lot to meet demand; (2) a heated restroom with running water; (3) an information plaza providing recreation and wayfinding information; (4) a bike repair station; (5) a picnic area; and (6) an interpretive exhibit to share the trail's rich history.

The BRRT is 4.5 miles long serving 143,000 visitors year-round and accommodating diverse recreation and commuting needs. The trail uniquely provides key trail continuity and connections to Minneapolis, St. Paul and the southern suburban metropolitan area. The trail links to the 72-mile Mississippi National River and Recreation Area, hundreds of miles of trails throughout the greater Twin Cities area, and historic landmarks including Fort Snelling, Pike Island and the city of Mendota, one of Minnesota's oldest settlements.

The total cost of this project will be $1,575,000. Dakota County is solely responsible for this initiative.

Project Rationale

Dakota County is requesting bond appropriations because the current trailhead site is inadequate. The parking lot is undersized, there is only a portable restroom and the site is without running water.

Other Considerations

n/a

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The County will increase its request for Operations and Maintenance appropriations in the future, depending on the final design of the greenway and the ongoing maintenance required.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County

Who will use or occupy this space?

n/a

Public Purpose

Regional Greenway trailhead to serve 143,000 annual visitors with improved parking, drinking water, toilets and public information.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Steve Mielke
Physical Development Division Director, Dakota County
952-891-7007
steven.mielke@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Big Rivers Regional Trail Trailhead

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$787	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$787	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,574**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$157	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$157	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,232	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$136	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,682**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Minnesota River Regional Trail, Eagan Segment

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,500
Priority Ranking:	5
Project Summary:	This request is for $2,500,000 in State bond funding to design and construct 3.2 miles of the Minnesota River Regional Trail (MNRRT) within the City of Eagan.

Project Description

The Eagan Extension of the MnRRT is a 3-mile trail in Fort Snelling State Park between Cedar Avenue and Lone Oak Road. It is the last critical trail gap in the MnRRT, and thus when constructed will complete a long planned regional trail between Burnsville and downtown St. Paul. The Extension includes a 10-foot off-road bituminous trail to serve pedestrians, bicyclists and other users of non-motorized transportation. It builds on existing facilities, including an existing trailhead at the Cedar Avenue Bridge and a new trailhead with parking being built at Lone Oak Road. The Eagan South Extension is entirely located within Fort Snelling State Park and will not require right of way acquisition.

This project will be in partnership with the Minnesota Department of Resources, the Minnesota Department of Transportation, and the City of Eagan, and supports each agency's mission. Trail construction includes site clearing, trail-bed preparation and surfacing, orientation signage, and landscaping.

Dakota County has committed to providing the local match and costs associated with project delivery. The Minnesota River Greenway is funded from the I35W bridge to 494 with the exception of the segment through Fort Snelling State Park in Eagan. The total cost of this segment of the trail will be $5,000,000, and it will be constructed solely by Dakota County.

Project Rationale

The Eagan South Extension will fill a gap between the popular Big Rivers Regional Trail and the Burnsville segment of Minnesota River Regional Trail (under construction 2015). In a larger context, the Eagan Extension responds to the need for a continuous trail along the Minnesota River called for by several plans and efforts at federal, state, local and nonprofit levels. Continued collaboration and trail development will link a major system of trails in the Minnesota River Valley from Ortonville to Le Sueur to St. Paul.

It will connect trails in Burnsville, Eagan, Bloomington, Mendota Heights, Minneapolis, St. Paul and beyond. Key connections include the Cedar Avenue and 494 bridges, providing direct access to jobs at the Mall of America, Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport, Twin Cities Premium Outlet Mall in Eagan, and workplaces along 494. Commuters will gain a safer, scenic, more direct route when this project is completed. As part of the larger Minnesota River Greenway, the Eagan South Extension will be a highlight, immersing visitors in the expansive Minnesota River Valley, providing views and long vistas that feel far removed from the urban environment. In addition to transportation benefits, trail users will experience Fort Snelling's impressive ecological and historical features. The trail will provide new opportunities for underserved populations in adjacent communities to access the outstanding natural resources at Fort Snelling State Park and the Minnesota Valley National Wildlife Refuge.

Other Considerations

n/a

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The County will increase its request for Operations and Maintenance appropriations in the future, depending on the final design of the greenway and the ongoing maintenance required.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County

Who will use or occupy this space?

n/a

Public Purpose

Regional greenway for recreation, transportation, water quality and habitat protection.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Steve Mielke
Physical Development Division Director, Dakota County
952-891-7007
steven.mielke@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Minnesota River Regional Trail, Eagan Segment

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$5,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$500	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$500	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$804	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$5,804**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

East/West Transit Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	6
Project Summary:	This request is for $2,000,000 to fund east-west oriented transit improvements in Dakota County.

Project Description

The Dakota County East-West Transit Study, anticipated to begin in early 2016 and take about a year, intends to address both existing and emerging needs and opportunities to improve the quality of transit service in Dakota County and improve connections to the regional transit system.

This study is expected to produce a set of recommended service improvements to the regional transit network that primarily address east-west travel needs. The study will also provide an estimate of capital and operating needs for each improvement, as well as additional improvements including shelters and expanded operating facilities. An implementation plan detailing a timeline for all service changes and addressing all relevant operating and policy considerations will also be produced. This bonding request would implement the near-term recommended improvements in the implementation plan.

Project Rationale

The County, in cooperation with the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority (MVTA), the Metropolitan Council, and its constituent cities, has made progress in developing transitway services that provide frequent limited stop service along several main thoroughfares in Dakota County. These transitways provide connections to major destinations and activity centers in Dakota, Hennepin, and Ramsey Counties. However, planned and established transitways in the County are all of a north-south orientation. The County plans to analyze opportunities for new or enhanced transit service operating in a generally east-west orientation to complement established and planned transitways.

Other Considerations

n/a

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Operating costs will fall to the owners/operators of the facilities. MVTA does not rely on State funds, but a small portion of Metro Transit's budget is funded by the State.

Who will own the facility?

MVTA and/or the Metropolitan Council, depending on the location of the defined improvements.

Who will operate the facility?

MVTA and/or the Metropolitan Council.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The facility would be operated by MVTA and/or the Metropolitan Council, both public entities.

Public Purpose

The project will expand transit to underserved areas and improve the quality of existing transit services.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Steve Mielke
Physical Development Director, Dakota County
952-891-7007
steven.mielke@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

East/West Transit Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$300	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$200	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$200	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$3,100	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$200	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$544	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,544**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Fiber Linking Public Facilities Across Dakota County

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,450
Priority Ranking:	7
Project Summary:	This request is for $1,450,000 in State bonding funding for 21.19 miles of fiber linking public facilities in the County. This will be the final link of an innovative, jointly-operated, amalgamated institutional network (I-Net), formed primarily from existing publicly-owned assets, that will serve public institutions throughout the County.

Project Description

The County will lay 21.19 miles of fiber, making the final connections for an amalgamated countywide I-Net, for a total cost of $3,442,000. This fiber will help the County form a backbone for the countywide I-Net, linking schools, libraries, museums, courthouses, traffic signals, and other public facilities throughout the County.

The project is part of an overall effort between Dakota County and its cities to develop I-Net, an institutional fiber network that that provides consolidated management and tracking of fiber assets and allows quick, easy, and cheap sharing of fiber. The network also eliminates redundancies in the fiber network and improves the network's reliability, thus improving the reliability of government services like police and firefighters. I-Net also allows connections with neighboring municipalities, thus helping to bolster a region-wide fiber network.

The County has already laid over 120 miles of fiber for I-Net. These existing County assets will be combined with more than 60 miles of other existing publicly-owned assets from other agencies under joint operation. This bonding request will fund the continued development of this network and finance key final last-piece connections between public facilities.

Project Rationale

This connected network provides an important regional benefit, serving Dakota County's 400,000+ citizens. Connecting these diverse facilities on a single robust fiber network will also strengthen network efficiency and security and promote intergovernmental collaboration.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minimal to zero; we expect the bond funds to be expended either directly by the County or via a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) with participating local governments.

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County or an assigned agency

Who will use or occupy this space?

There are no current plans for private entities to lease the fiber from the County, although there is potential for this in the future.

Public Purpose

This will allow public facilities throughout the County to access an enhanced robust, interconnected broadband infrastructure.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Matt Smith
Deputy County Manager
651-438-4590
matt.smith@co.dakota.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Fiber Linking Public Facilities Across Dakota County

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,450	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$1,450	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,900**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$465	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,435	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$272	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,172**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Dennison, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Lift Station and Sewer Projects	1	GO	$ 730	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 730	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 730	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Lift Station and Sewer Projects

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$730
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The City of Dennison is requesting $730,000 in state funds to predesign, design and construct a lift station. In addition, we plan to line our sanitary sewer lines.

Project Description

The City of Dennison will rebuild the lift station and wet well. The plan also includes running electricity to the sewer ponds. To help prevent water infiltration in our sewer lines, which could give the City another 20-30% capacity in our sewer ponds, we will line our sanitary sewer lines. An estimated 4,300 feet of sewer lines and 22 manholes will be lined. The cost is based on lining 8" pipe, $90 per foot. Lining each manhole is around $1,000. With a 15% contingency, total cost is around $500,000. The new lift station will be built next to the existing lift station. All control panels will be above ground. Projected costs for the lift station, wet well and electricity to our sewer ponds will amount to $230,000. To help pay for the projects, the city council approved collecting a $25 monthly water fee increase, and this amounts to about $1,800 per month. That money is going into a dedicated Sewer Captial Fund. The city has also set aside $33,000 in a sewer savings account for the lift station/ sewer projects.

Project Rationale

Currently, our lift station doesn't meet OSHA standards for confined space issues. The original lift station was built in 1962, which was a metal tube structure, and was last upgraded in 1992. In the long term, it makes sense to rebuild than fix up the current one. The wet well, which was built in 1962 and remains next to our lift station, will be closed. The main reason to close the wet well is the fact there's a flow valve in the bottom and the ductile pipe could fail at any time and allow sewage to flow into a nearby creek.

Other Considerations

Because of the lift station, it's difficult finding anyone to apply for our open sewer/water operator position. Once improvements are made, it will make the position more desirable and fulfill a critical need for our City. With the addition of electricity to our sewer ponds, this will cut down on labor hours needed to discharge the water. I believe it will be another incentive to attract applicants for our city maintenance position as well.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Small impact, hopefully.

Who will own the facility?

City of Dennison

Who will operate the facility?

City of Dennison

Who will use or occupy this space?

No private use.

Public Purpose

Needed public infrastructure for the City of Dennison

Description of Previous Appropriations

None, as far as I know.

Project Contact Person

Jeffrrey W. Flaten
Mayor
507-338-9619
jflaten19@gmail.com

($ in thousands)

Lift Station and Sewer Projects

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$730	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$33	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$15	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$778**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$1	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$9	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$720	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$44	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$774**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Detroit Lakes, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Detroit Lakes Public Utilities Waste Water Treatment Plant	1	GO	$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Detroit Lakes Public Utilities Waste Water Treatment Plant

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$15,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$15 million in state funds is requested to acquire, predesign, design, construct, and initiate operation for a new wastewater treatment facility for the City of Detroit Lakes.

Project Description

The Detroit Lakes Public Utilities Commission (DLPUC) commissioned a Facility Plan in accordance with NPDES permit and to:

- Address the phosphorous and toxicity limits in the current NPDES permit and comply with the required water quality based effluent limit (WQBEL) of 198 kg/yr by October 1, 2022.
- Assess the existing WWTF structures for potential re-use or re-purposing.
- Estimate flows and loads to the WWTF for the 20-year design period (2038) including planned annexations.
- Evaluate alternate discharge locations, options for discharge (seasonal vs year round), and technologies for liquid and solids treatment improvements.
- Develop cost estimates for treatment alternatives and evaluate user rate impacts resulting from recommended improvements.

The facility plan's recommended alternative is construction of a new wastewater treatment facility at the existing facility site with continuous discharge year around to St Clair Lake. The total estimated project cost for the liquid treatment and solids treatment improvements is $30,489,000. The City is requesting state bonding to help with 50% of the costs and will apply for a low interest loan from the Clean Water Fund for the remainder of the project costs.

The proposed wastewater treatment facilities will consist of the following major elements:

· New preliminary treatment building to house new mechanical screening, a wetwell, and new wastewater pumps.

· Replace aerated grit basin with vortex grit system; modify existing Grit Building for electrical equipment.

· New liquid process treatment to replace primary, secondary, tertiary treatment system.

· New Chemical feed systems.

· New UV disinfection system.

· Rehabilitate or retrofit solids stabilization process and address return stream flows.

· New biosolids dewatering facility and cake storage.

- New effluent discharge piping from the WWTF site to County ditch or St Claire Lake with re-aeration consideration if needed.
- Expanded garage, office & laboratory.
- Electrical/I&C upgrades
- SCADA upgrades for the new and rehabilitated processes at the WWTF.
- New on site back-up generation.
- Site, mechanical, electrical, and piping work to accommodate new structures.
- Demolition of chemical precipitation plant equipment and building structures.
- Decommission the 3-acre aerated pond and 25-acre stabilization pond.
- Abandon-in-place of the existing Rapid Infiltration Basins and Spray Irrigation systems.

Project Rationale

The City of Detroit Lakes discharges treated wastewater to a shallow lake called St. Clair Lake. St. Clair Lake was placed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters in 2006. A Total Maximum Daily Load Study (TMDL) study was conducted for the lake due to phosphorous impairment. The TMDL study determined the mass loading for the Detroit Lakes wastewater treatment facility to be 198 kg/yr total phosphorous, which is a 93% reduction from current permitted limit. The projected average wet weather flow for the Detroit Lakes WWTF is 2.2 Million Gallons per Day (MGD). At the projected flow, the concentration limit equivalent is around 0.066 mg/L.

Other Considerations

The current Detroit Lakes wastewater treatment plant is not designed to meet the "ultra low" phosphorous limit needed to protect St. Clair Lake and downstream lakes. Significant capital improvements are necessary to achieve compliance. A 1.0 mg/L limit is considered to be low in Minnesota; Detroit Lakes will need to be at or below 0.066 mg/L, which may possibly be the most stringent limit in the upper Midwest. The new limit is a 93% reduction from the current NPDES permit limit for phosphorous. There is precedence for state funding for this type of request, as can be seen in Litchfield and Willmar.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No State dollars will be requested for the operations of this facility

Who will own the facility?

City of Detroit Lakes

Who will operate the facility?

Detroit Lakes Public Utilities

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

Wastewater treatment is needed for safe and sanitary disposal of waste in such a manner to provide for sound environmental stewardship. With the proposed effluent limits for the Detroit Lakes facility, it will provide a delicate balance between discharge water quality and ensuring water quality so that we can use our rivers and streams for fishing, swimming and drinking water. In the 20th Century, pollution problems and their control were primarily local, not state or national, concerns. Since then, population and industrial growth have increased demands on our natural resources, altering the situation drastically. This facility will provide for maintaining water quality in many of the area lakes and preserve water and lake quality in a multi-county area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Vernell Roberts
General Manager Public Utilities
218-847-7609
vroberts@ci.detroit-lakes.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Detroit Lakes Public Utilities Waste Water Treatment Plant

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$15,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$21,823	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$36,823**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$3,700	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$25,300	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$6,323	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$36,823**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Duluth International Airport

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Runway Reconstruction and Realignment Project	1	GO	$ 5,274	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 5,274	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 5,274	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Runway Reconstruction and Realignment Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$5,274
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The Duluth Airport Authority (DAA) is requesting $5,273,820 in state bond funds, to be matched by $52,738,200 in Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program funds (FAA AIP) and potential MnDOT Aeronautics funds. These funds will be used for design and construction of two existing runways and associated taxiways.

Project Description

The DAA is initiating a 10 year program for infrastructure preservation and enhancement of Duluth International and Sky Harbor Airports of Duluth, Minnesota. This bonding request represents Years 1 through 4 of this program.

Runway 9/27, the main runway at the Duluth International Airport, is in need of a major reconstruction effort in the very near future to provide safe and reliable runway infrastructure for civil and military aircraft operations. At 10,162 feet in length, this runway at DLH serves commercial, military, and general aviation operations. The concrete pavement on Runway 9/27 has been in place since the 1940s and recent geotechnical studies have indicated that it is reaching the end of its useful life. The ten year program includes complete runway and taxiway reconstruction.

One of the challenges during any reconstruction would be the displacement of the 148th Fighter Wing, located in Duluth. The 148th Fighter Wing is expected to be engaged offsite in April of 2016 for a period of three to six months, and will likely take the majority of their aircraft with them. Without the military presence at the airport, a unique opportunity presents itself to reconstruct the middle 6,200 feet of Runway 9/27. The F16 is extremely susceptible to foreign object debris (FOD) which can be more prevalent during construction. Reconstructing the middle section of Runway 9/27 while the 148th is offsite also relieves the need for a costly temporary relocation of the fighter wing during construction that could also attract unwanted attention of a future base realignment and closure (BRAC) process in Washington DC.

The current air carrier fleet mix can be accommodated on the existing crosswind runway of 5,700 feet in length. While the regularly scheduled air carriers servicing Duluth (Delta and United) are moving away from 50-seat regional jets, they have not divested themselves of them to this point.

The current fleet mix can be accommodated during the limited period of construction in 2016.

Runway 14/32 located at the DAA's Sky Harbor Airport has been in operation on Minnesota Point since 1939 and consists of a single 3,050 foot runway and a seaplane ramp and dock for seaplane access. The unique location of the airport allows it to serve a wide variety of users including multiple businesses and U.S. Customs Services. Over time, a number of red and white pine trees located off the south end of the runway within airport property and the Minnesota Point Pine Forest Scientific and Natural Area (SNA) have grown tall enough to be considered obstructions for aircraft on approach to the airport. A majority of the obstructing trees are part of the old growth forest protected by the SNA. The old growth forest on Minnesota Point is uniquely significant in Minnesota by virtue of its presence on Lake Superior sand dunes, with the red and white pine woodland, its understory components, and ecological setting being the only example of this in Minnesota. In 2006, Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT) Office of Aeronautics directed the airport to clear the trees on the approach to the runway in order to maintain a State of Minnesota airport license.

The Duluth Airport Authority (DAA) is in the final stages of the state and federal environmental review for Sky Harbor Airport, which was completed in the summer of 2015, for a solution that prevents the need to remove any trees or otherwise impact the SNA. DAA has worked in consultation with many federal and state agencies, as well as local interested public groups throughout the environmental review process. The DAA is proposing to shorten the runway to 2,600 feet and rotate the runway onto new fill material in Superior Bay in order to relocate the runway approach outside of the SNA. While no expanded or improved facilities or services will be provided to airport users, the project serves to protect the valuable resources within the SNA. The next step in the process is to secure project funding, obtain permits and complete project design. Construction is expected to occur over a 3-year period.

The estimated total project costs are $52,738,200. The total amount of state bond funds requested at this time is $5,273,820. These funds are expected to leverage Federal Aviation Administration AIP funds in the amount of $47,464,380 and have potential to leverage MnDOT Aeronautics funds as well. The DAA will continue to seek additional commitments from MnDOT Aeronautics if funding is available. These amounts have been updated from our initial June 2015 application.

The FAA has provided an unprecedented grant for the first portion of construction under the condition that the project schedule be condensed, with final design, plans and specifications developed and in place for a spring of 2016 construction schedule. This time coincides with the deployment of the 148th Fighter Wing. The DAA is requesting $1,945,760 of the total bonding request is reimbursable to match the above committed funds, as the construction activities will be underway prior to the availability of the funds. It is the DAA's understanding that there is a precedent and procedure which allows for this reimbursement.

Project Rationale

The DAA is initiating a 10 year program for infrastructure preservation and enhancement. This bonding request represents Years 1 through 4 of this program.

Runway 9/27 at Duluth International Airport has been in place for over 60 years and must be reconstructed to accommodate passenger, business and commercial operations. Preservation and enhancement of this infrastructure is critical for the continued success of Duluth's aviation sector, which is expected to create approximately 1,000 jobs in the area over the next decade (See narrative). Runway 14/32 at Duluth's Sky Harbor Airport needs to be realigned in order to preserve the Minnesota Point Pine Forest Scientific and Natural Area (SNA) (See narrative).

The successful completion of the airport reconstruction/realignment project will have a multitude of positive benefits. The existing SNA will be protected, an additional 10.35 acres of DAA property will be added to the SNA, the 148th Fighter Wing will remain in Duluth, MN at its existing site, infrastructure will be in place to support the thriving aviation sector in Duluth, the DAA will not be in jeopardy of losing a significant amount of Federal dollars both committed and expected, and the airport will continue to function in an efficient and effective manner.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Duluth Airport Aurhority

Who will operate the facility?

Duluth Airport Authority

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

General Use Airport

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Thomas Werner
Executive Director
218-625-7766
twerner@duluthairport.com

($ in thousands)

Runway Reconstruction and Realignment Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$5,274	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$0	$47,464	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$52,738**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$8,438	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$44,300	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$52,738**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Duluth, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Duluth Energy Systems - Superior Street steam to hot water conversion project	1	GO	$ 21,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 21,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 21,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Duluth Energy Systems - Superior Street steam to hot water conversion project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$21,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$21 million is requested to design, construct, and implement major energy efficiency improvements to the City of Duluth's steam facility and distribution system through the conversion of the system from steam to hot water. This conversion will significantly increase energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions in the system by enabling the future conversion of fuel source from coal to a mix of natural gas and regionally sourced biomass.

Project Description

Duluth Energy Systems is owned by the City of Duluth and has an operating partnership with Ever-Green Energy. Ever-Green Energy operates the highly successful St. Paul and Energy Park district energy systems and oversaw St.Paul's hot water conversion and development over the past thirty years, along with the transitioning of its primary fuel source from coal to a variety of renewable energy sources. Together, the City and Ever-Green Energy are driving an energy transformation in Duluth. This transformation will be a model for the State's energy independence and carbon reduction initiatives and also has the potential for helping to revitalize the Arrowhead region's wood product industry. The steam to hot water conversion will also enable the integration of combined heat and power (CHP), which supports the State's efforts to leverage CHP as a solution for waste heat and energy efficiency.

This energy transformation is a once-in-a-generation opportunity that begins with the conversion of the City's antiquated district heating system from a one-time through steam system to a closed -loop hot water system. The current system takes 90 million gallons of treated 40¿ water from Lake Superior and heats it to 360¿ to create high pressure steam. The steam is distributed to over 165 buildings downtown and in Canal Park where much of the thermal energy is drawn off to heat the building space. The cooled steam condenses to hot water at approximately 180¿ and is then dumped into WLSSD's wastewater treatment system and then back into Lake Superior, carrying the remaining thermal energy with it. Then the process starts all over again with additional cold Lake Superior water. The new closed-loop hot water system will return the used hot water with its remaining thermal energy back to the plant to be reheated and reused.

To ensure that Duluth Energy Systems remains robust, reliable, resilient and flexible, the 83 year old system needs to complete this major efficiency upgrade to continue to meet the needs of the Duluth community and set the stage for further economic development. The system provides heating, hot water, and air conditioning to over 165 downtown Duluth and Canal Park buildings, including service to both major hospital complexes and related clinics. Currently, the primary fuel source is low-sulphur coal. With these project improvements, Duluth Energy Systems will gain the flexibility to expand its service territory, reduce operating costs and greenhouse gas emissions and create new economic development opportunities.

Some current customers are served through hot water while the majority are served by steam, which is much less efficient than hot water. The system upgrade will reduce energy losses at the plant, while also reducing losses within the Duluth buildings. Water usage from Lake Superior will also be greatly reduced, by approximately 25 million gallons per year with a commensurate reduction in water treatment at the City's water treatment plant on the front end and at WLSSD on the back end. Because of the reduction in the amount of water needed to be heated as well as the much lower temperatures required for hot water vs steam, the plant will see significant reductions in fossil fuel consumption and related CO2 and other greenhouse gas and other air emissions at the head of Lake Superior.

These environmental improvements are cost-effective and achievable while Superior Street is being reconstructed with the replacement of other utilities starting in 2017. The local match will be a combination of cash and bonds.

Total Project Cost	$42M
Local Match	$21M

Local Match Breakdown	
Sanitary Enterprise Fund	$ 3M
Water Enterprise Fund	$ 5M
Storm Water Enterprise Fund	$ 2M
Cash and Bonds	$ 11M

Project Rationale

The current steam system is 83 years old and is in need of a multitude of upgrades to enable the system to continue to serve the community and reduce its environmental impact and carbon footprint. The City of Duluth will be undertaking a major reconstruction of Superior Street, its main downtown commercial and retail thoroughfare, beginning in 2017. This provides a once-in-a-generation opportunity to install a modern, efficient, closed-loop hot water system rather than replacing the inefficient and outdated 1930s steam system. The project will reduce water, energy, and chemical consumption. The project will also reduce green house gas emissions and water and sewer costs while optimizing opportunities for additional economic development in Duluth. Timing of project construction needs to coincide with the Superior Street renovation to maximize construction cost savings for the project.

Other Considerations

This project is the critical starting point to pave the way for future integration of alternative energy technologies, such as combined heat and power, solar thermal, and waste heat recovery. The steam to hot water transition is the essential first phase of a multi-year master plan that is key to a sustainable energy infrastructure. The integration of advanced technologies, flexible and regionally-sourced fuels, and energy efficiency improvements, are entirely dependent on this steam to hot water conversion. In addition to the environmental and economic benefits, this system evolution delivers much-needed resilience for the Duluth community. The current system must be upgraded to ensure

that vulnerable populations and critical services maintain their energy supply in the event of a crisis, similar to that experienced during the 2012 Duluth flood. Shifting to hot water distribution, improving the flexibility of the system, and integration of combined heat and power would address those liabilities and help Duluth be prepared for environmental and economic volatility.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Once completed, the phase of the multi-year project will be self-sustaining with no new or additional state operating dollars required from the state.

Who will own the facility?

The facility will remain under the ownership of the City of Duluth, as it has been since 1979.

Who will operate the facility?

The facility will continue to be operated under an agreement with Ever-Green Energy.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The facility is owned by the city; Ever-Green Energy manages and operates the system.

Public Purpose

Duluth Energy Systems is a community energy system providing heating, air conditioning, and hot water to building occupants in downtown Duluth and Canal Park. Buildings served by the system include two hospitals, city, county, and federal buildings, small businesses, social services, several hotels, an arena, convention center, and many restaurants and retail establishments as well as businesses that form the infrastructure of city life.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Duluth Energy Systems has not received a prior appropriation.

Project Contact Person

David Montgomery
Chief Administrative Officer
218-730-5307
dmontgomery@duluthmn.gov

($ in thousands)

Duluth Energy Systems - Superior Street steam to hot water conversion project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$21,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$10,000	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$11,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$42,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$3,702	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$38,298	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$42,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

East Grand Forks, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Interconnect with Grand Forks, North Dakota and the Decommissioning of the Existing Stabilization Ponds	1	GO	$ 5,300	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 5,300	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 5,300	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Interconnect with Grand Forks, North Dakota and the Decommissioning of the Existing Stabilization Ponds

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$5,300
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$5.3 million in State funds is requested to design, construct a wastewater interconnect from the City of East Grand Forks to the City of Grand Forks, North Dakota and the decommissioning of the existing stabilization ponds.

Project Description

Based on the decision to design and construct the interconnect with the City of Grand Forks, North Dakota, the project will involve the following items for the $10.6 million dollar project;

Phase 1 of the project will involve the construction of a lift station, equalization basin and forcemain on the Minnesota side and a forcemain and a meter manhole on the North Dakota side.(see attached maps)

The remaining $5.3 million of other State funds will come from the Public Facility Authority(PFA) through their Intended Use Plan(IUP). The City has been in contact with PFA about the use of Minnesota funds in the State of North Dakota and they have asked the City to provide an ownership and operation narrative to explain the use of funds in North Dakota(please see attached).

The City of East Grand Forks has completed the pre-design at their own cost, which was the Facility Plan as attached.

Project Rationale

The City's current waste water treatment facility is a two lagoon settlement facility constructed in 1958.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has informed the City that its waste water treatment facility is currently operating at approximately ninety percent(90%) of capacity. This leaves little room for expansion in the City, either residential or commercial, and the MPCA has warned the City the new development in the City may be limited or curtailed until such time that the City's waste water treatment capacity is increased.

MPCA has also informed the City that its current waste water treatment facility is leaking. While the leakage rate from the current facility exceeds current standards, the City has been informed that the continued leakage at the current rate does not pose a problem. However, the City is concerned that the leakage rate from a 50 year old waste treatment facility is unpredictable at best. The City desires to address and fix the leakage problem before it grows to an unmanageable and unacceptable level.

Therefore, because of the capacity and leakage issues the City needs to upgrade their present

wastewater treatment system

The City of East Grand Forks looked at three(3) alternatives; the first was to update the stabilization ponds to MPCA current standards, the second alternative was to build a mechanical plant and the third alternative was to build an interconnect with City of Grand Forks, North Dakota.

The City performed a 30 year net present value for all three alternatives and the results are as follows: The upgrade to the stabilization pond was $36.7 million, the mechanical plant was $29.4 million and the interconnect was $10.6 million. Therefore, the City elected to proceed with the interconnect with Grand Forks.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

The City of East Grand Forks, Minnesota will own the lift station, equalization basin and the forcemain up to the center line of the Red River of the North in Minnesota and the City of Grand Forks, North Dakota will own the forcemain and meter manhole form the center line of the Red River of the North into North Dakota.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of East Grand Forks will operate the facility on the Minnesota side of the Red River and Grand Forks will operate the system on the North Dakota side of the Red River of the North.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

The public purpose will be to treat the waste water from East Grand Forks, Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

David Murphy
City Administrator
218-773-2483
admin@egf.mn

($ in thousands)

Interconnect with Grand Forks, North Dakota and the Decommissioning of the Existing Stabilization Ponds

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$5,300	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$5,300	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,600**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,460	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$9,140	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$931	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$11,531**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

Ely, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
17th Avenue East/ Vermilion Community College/ Business Park Infrastructure	1	GO	$ 1,300	$ 0	$ 0
West End Recreation Trailhead Development/ Community Hospital Access Improvements	2	GO	$ 1,300	$ 0	$ 0
Greater Minnesota Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program	3	GO	$ 20,000	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
Total Project Requests			$ 22,600	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 22,600	$ 20,000	$ 20,000

($ in thousands)

17th Avenue East/ Vermilion Community College/ Business Park Infrastructure

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,300
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The City of Ely is requesting state funding to provide for adequate water, sewer, pedestrian and street infrastructure to support the Ely Business Park, the Industrial Park and Vermilion Community College. These improvements are required to support current facilities and proposed economic development and job creation.

Project Description

The City of Ely is hereby submitting a request for capital budget consideration in the 2016 legislative session for the required improvements to infrastructure for the Vermilion Community College housing project, industrial park and the existing and recently expanded Ely Business Park. The project is located in the City of Ely in St. Louis County. This project has been determined by both the Ely Economic Development Authority and the City of Ely to be the top priority project in 2015 and 2016 for funding. The City of Ely also has the support of the Ely Chamber of Commerce and the Ely Area Joint Powers.

The total cost for all portions of this project is $8,400,000. The amount of state funds requested in the 2016 bonding cycle is $1,300,000. The original request for this project was $1,800,000. Due to fast tracking of the business park infrastructure project, and use of non- state general fund money, the utilities and roadway infrastructure for the business park are currently being completed. Currently we are working with a business interested in building on the new site. The overall estimated cost to complete the business park expansion and development is $1.0 million. The City of Ely will fund the remaining work through sources other than State bonding funds.

Vermilion Community College is currently in the bidding phase of a one hundred twenty bed, student housing project. This project currently has $5.8 million in funding secured. The project was funded by $4.0 million in revenue bonds, $1.1 million through a Minnesota Housing grant, $350,000 from an IRRRB infrastructure grant and $350,000 from VCC's capital budget. Construction of the housing units is planned to start in the spring of 2016.

Upon the completion of the new student housing units a parking lot needs to be constructed for the additional students living on campus. A parking lot for 120 cars is planned in the location of the existing modular housing units. The estimated cost to remove the modular housing units and construct a parking lot and required sidewalks is $295,800. This construction would also correct safety issues with the current alignment of the driveways in this area. It would also provide for a sidewalk for student to safely access 17th avenue and local shopping and restaurants. The parking lot would be maintained and owned by Vermilion Community College. Removal of the modular housing units and construction of the parking lot is anticipated in late 2016.

17th Avenue East is the access route to the existing and proposed housing units. This roadway is gravel with a narrow shoulder and no sidewalks. This roadway is also the main access road for the Industrial Park and Business Park. Many businesses in this area are negatively affected by the lack of adequate infrastructure in this area. With the high level of traffic, the roadway remains muddy and rutted every spring, being nearly impassible at times. There is also a large drainage ditch in this area that collects

storm sewer from TH 169 and a large area of Ely. During numerous rain events in the past the ditch has been over capacity resulting in culvert washouts and road closure.

This route is also used by student pedestrians to walk to and from school and to the downtown shopping area. Without a designated sidewalk and the muddy conditions, it is a safety concern. With the completion of proper sidewalks and designated crossings the students will be able to access the local shopping. The utilities in this area are also inadequate and require replacement. The water main is of a substandard size and requires replacement to meet proper fire flow standards. The sanitary sewer in this area also requires improvements. The estimated project cost to upgrade the utilities and reconstruct and pave the roadway is $1,532,800. This roadway is owned by the City of Ely and would continue to be maintained by the City. This is a shovel ready project that could be completed in 2016.

Vermilion Community College is part of the state education system and is an importation educational facility for the region and the State of Minnesota. The College is also a major employer in the region and critical asset for the community.

The City of Ely has also applied to MNDOT and DEED through the 2015 Transportation Economic Development Program (TED) for funding to improve the transportation system in this area for both vehicles and pedestrians.

Project Rationale

17th Avenue East is the access route to the existing and proposed housing units. This roadway is gravel with a narrow shoulder and no sidewalks. This roadway is also the main access road for the Industrial Park and Business Park. Many businesses in this area are negatively affected by the lack of adequate infrastructure in this area. With the high level of traffic, the roadway remains muddy and rutted every spring, being nearly impassible at times. There is also a large drainage ditch in this area that collects storm sewer from TH 169 and a large area of Ely. During numerous rain events in the past the ditch has been over capacity resulting in culvert washouts and road closure.

This route is also used by student pedestrians to walk to and from school and to the downtown shopping area. Without a designated sidewalk and the muddy conditions, it is a safety concern. With the completion of proper sidewalks and designated crossings the students will be able to access the local shopping. The utilities in this area are also inadequate and require replacement. The water main is of a substandard size and requires replacement to meet proper fire flow standards. The sanitary sewer in this area also requires improvements.

Vermilion Community College is part of the state education system and is an importation educational facility for the region and the State of Minnesota. The College is also a major employer in the region and critical asset for the community.

Other Considerations

17th Avenue also is the current route for the snowmobile trail and is planned to be utilized for part of the Prospector's Loop Trail ATV route during the summer months and be part of the Prospectors Trail. The project includes dedicated markings for all uses.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The requested funding will not effect state operating dollars

Who will own the facility?

The City of Ely will own all infrastructure and roadways.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Ely.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Currently the Business Park and Industrial Park are home to many private contractors and businesses. The State Department of Revenue is also located in the existing Business Park. Current interest in the expanded Business Park lots include private businesses as well. The City of Ely also has a building which houses the VA Clinic, MNDOR, and a government travel agency.

Public Purpose

Public infrastructure for roadways, and utility improvements.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Harold R. Langowski
Clerk-Treasurer
218-226-5474
elyod@ely.mn.us

($ in thousands)

17th Avenue East/ Vermilion Community College/ Business Park Infrastructure

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,300	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$350	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$6,950	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,600**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$8,600	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,600**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

West End Recreation Trailhead Development/ Community Hospital Access Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,300
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	The City of Ely is working with community partners to develop a recreation trail complex, visitors rest stop on the entrance to Ely and provide for planning of improved access to the Ely Bloomenson Hospital Campus and Emergency Services building.

Project Description

The City of Ely is hereby submitting a request for capital budget consideration in the 2016 legislative session for the development of a trailhead facility. The project is located in the City of Ely in St. Louis County. The City of Ely is currently working with the various trail groups and has made this development a priority for economic development of the area.

The total cost for all portions of this project is $2,800,000. The amount of state funds requested in the 2016 bonding cycle is $1,300,000. The trail projects are being funded by other funding sources and are not part of this request.

The Prospectors Loop Alliance is working to develop an all terrain vehicle trail system connecting Ely and many other communities in the region by a designated route. This effort is a collaboration of all area cities, townships and Lake and St. Louis County. The details of this project are still being worked out and it is anticipated that the trail system will be included in State funding requests.

The Taconite Snowmobile Trail is also a significant economic and recreation resource for the businesses and citizens of the region. The local snowmobile club maintains this route, with assistance from the state, and the winter use is critical to the area economy.

The Mesabi Trail is also working on the final sections of trail alignment to complete the trail route from Ely to Grand Rapids. This will be a great asset for the region to attract additional visitors and drive economic development and additional recreation opportunities.

To provide for trail access and proper facilities for trail users coming to Ely, the City of Ely is planning a trail head be constructed on the west end of town near highway 169. The trailhead would provide for parking, visitors information, and a rest stop for trail users. The City of Ely has also looked at other commercial and recreation opportunities in this area for further development. The preliminary cost to develop the infrastructure and parking for a trailhead was estimated at $1,300,000. The trailhead facility and parking would be owned and maintained by the City of Ely. This is a shovel ready project that could be completed in 2016. This portion of the project would be considered phase one.

The City of Ely has been working with The Ely Bloomenson community Hospital on a development agreement concerning future hospital expansion in this same area. The Ely Area Joint Powers Ambulance Service is also planning the construction of a new ambulance garage in this same area. To improve access to the hospital, clinic and nursing home it is planned to construct an extension to Pattison Street to provide a direct connection from Highway 169 to County Highway 21. This would allow for

direct access by emergency vehicles to the hospital without having to travel through residential neighborhoods. This route would also allow for a bypass for commercial traffic as well. With future development of other City property in this area this would promote additional economic development and job creation. The City of Ely will continue to develop this as a master plan to incorporate future recreation, economic, residential and public health and safety in this area. This project would be completed in future phases. It is estimated that this future phase of this project will cost $1,500,000.

Project Rationale

The City of Ely is currently working with the Prospectors Loop Alliance Board, The Mesabi Trail Group and the Minnesota DNR and local snowmobile club concerning the trail systems connecting Ely to the rest of the Region. Through the development and promotion of these trail systems a significant economic impact can be realized by the City of Ely and the region.

With these three regional trails coming to Ely, a trail head is needed to accommodate these trail users as well as the thousands of tourists that travel to Ely.

Other Considerations

By planning for the convergence of all three trail systems at the west entrance to Ely a combined trail head can be utilized for all three trail systems. This combined effort will reduce redundancy and reduce overall project costs. The combined trail head will also allow for reduced future maintenance and reduce the overall burden on the tax payers.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There is no impact on state operating budgets anticipated..

Who will own the facility?

The City of Ely

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Ely

Who will use or occupy this space?

The proposed trail head complex may include vending facilities or private businesses providing services to the trail users. This may require future lease considerations.

Public Purpose

Provide for a trail head for the Taconite snowmobile trail, future Mesabi Trail, and the proposed Prospector's Loop ATV trail.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Harold R. Langowski
Clerk-Treasurer
218-226-5474
elyod@ely.mn.us

($ in thousands)

West End Recreation Trailhead Development/ Community Hospital Access Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,300	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,800**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,800	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,800**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Greater Minnesota Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$20,000
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	The City of Ely is requesting $20 million in state bonding funds on behalf of the Coalition of Greater Minnesota Cities for the Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program.

Project Description

This request is for $20 million in state bonding funding for grants to greater Minnesota cities to stimulate new economic development and/or create or retains jobs through public infrastructure investments for industrial park development and/or business expansion that would not occur without public financial assistance.

For more than a decade, the Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant program has helped small and large cities in Greater Minnesota build the required infrastructure for businesses to locate or expand. A list of cities that have received these grants is attached.

Under the program, cities receive grants of up to 50 percent of the capital costs of industrial park development or other projects that will keep or enhance jobs, increase a city's tax base, and expand or create new economic development. Eligible projects are publicly owned infrastructure that may include wastewater collection and treatment, drinking water, storm sewers, utility extensions, and streets that support economic development projects. Projects include manufacturing, technology, warehousing and distribution, research and development, and agricultural processing.

The return on investment and job creation arising a result of this program has been phenomenal. Between 2003 and the end of 2010, more than 90 cities received grants and more than 2400 jobs were created. According to DEED, during that time frame, nearly $134 million in total investment resulted, a nearly 4 to 1 return on the state investment. The program is almost always oversubscribed. Between 2003 and 2010, $40.5 million was appropriated, and over $31 million additional requests from local communities went unfunded.

The program is restricted to Greater Minnesota communities for good reason. Greater Minnesota does not have the abundance of business redevelopment opportunities and resources that the Twin Cities Metropolitan area possesses. Other programs at DEED are not adequate to address the economic development needs of Greater Minnesota. Although other programs may provide funding for roads or wastewater grants, this grant program addresses the multiple needs that may exist for a development project. In this way the program provides flexibility and comprehensiveness for Greater Minnesota communities to increase their economic development and job opportunities.

The grant program has regional and statewide significance because cities throughout Greater Minnesota participate.

This program is a model of efficiency in that a city may receive no more than $1,000,000 in two years for one or more projects. If after five years the project has not proceeded in a timely manner

and is unlikely to be completed, the grant will be cancelled and grant money awarded to the city must be returned. Cities must provide a match of at least 50 percent of the project capital costs. The city receiving the grant must provide for the remainder of the capital costs of the project, either in cash or in-kind contributions.

Project Rationale

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The Department of Employment and Economic Development will administer the grant program. Eligible applicants are statutory or home rule cities outside the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area.

Who will operate the facility?

Statutory or home rule cities outside the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area receiving the grants will operate the facilities.

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

Public Infrastructure to support job creation and economic development.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Between 2003 and 2010, $40.5 million was appropriated, and over $31 million in additional requests from local communities were unfunded.

Project Contact Person

Heidi Omerza
Councilmember, Ely, MN and President of the Coalition of Greater Minnesota Cities
218-235-1125
heidiomerza@ely.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Greater Minnesota Business Development Public Infrastructure Grant Program

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$20,000	$20,000	$20,000
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$20,000	$20,000	$20,000
TOTAL	**$0**	**$40,000**	**$40,000**	**$40,000**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$40,000	$40,000	$40,000
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$40,000**	**$40,000**	**$40,000**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Eveleth, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Eveleth Alice/Fayal Location Site Redevelopment - Brownfield Cleanup and Infrastructure	1	GO	$ 447	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 447	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 447	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Eveleth Alice/Fayal Location Site Redevelopment - Brownfield Cleanup and Infrastructure

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$447
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$447,000 in state funds is requested for brownfield cleanup and to design and install public utilities and roadways for industrial/commercial development on a historically industrial blighted brownfield site in the Alice and Fayal Locations in Eveleth, MN.

Project Description

The City of Eveleth (6.45 square miles and population 3718) located on the Virginia Horn of the Mesabi Range, owns 12.44 acres (Alice Location) acquired from Eveleth Mines LLC in 1997 and .83 adjacent acres (Fayal Location) acquired from Arrowhead Senior Living Community in 2014. The City has limited land for new development and has made the redevelopment of these properties a priority: brownfield cleanup per MPCA guidelines; design and install public utilities and a roadway; and develop lots for sale for commercial/industrial use.

Historical Use and Development:

The property is located along the former main railroad corridor into the commercial district of Eveleth, situated between the developed part of Eveleth and a historical open pit to the south. Original uses included Fitger Brewing beer depot, Duluth and Iron Range Railroad main track and two additional rail spurs, Duluth and Iron Range Railroad freight and passenger depot, sash and door warehouse, two lime warehouses, Schultz Brewing Company beer depot, a gas fueling station, and the Colvin-Robb Lumber Yard. Coal sheds were added to the property in 1906.

Recent Use:

Laundry facility, Petroleum bulk tank storage, concrete plant, contractor storage and open space (most uses authorized with land licenses between the City and user).

Current Status:

The petroleum bulk storage and concrete plant have been removed by the land license holders and the City. The City has commenced work on cleaning up the title encumbrances. These encumbrances restrict the City from conveying clean title to a future user or a future user getting a mortgage for development on the property.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and a Phase II Site Investigation and preliminary Risk Assessment were completed on the properties in 2013 and 2014. The field work and

documents associated with this work were funded by a United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) Assessment Grant for Hazardous Substances and Petroleum (Grant 00E00897-0) in the amount of $154,010. In July 2013, the City enrolled the properties into the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) Voluntary Brownfields Program in response to measured poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and diesel range organics (DRO) concentrations in near surface soils on the property. MPCA staff assigned the Property the numbers VP30370 and PB4394.

In May 2015, the City applied to the DEED Contamination Cleanup & Investigation Grant Program to complete a Response Action Plan (RAP) which is the next step in the redevelopment process for these properties. Once the RAP is completed, it is presumed that additional work may be required by MPCA staff; additional work may include mitigating vapor intrusion pathways and / or cleanup of the property.

At a minimum, to eliminate a vapor intrusion pathway it may be required that passive vapor barriers are added to new building construction. The cost of these barriers is estimated to be about $1.50 per square foot. In buildings that already exist, the concrete slabs should be sealed to minimize vapor intrusion. Vapor retarder paint costs about $60.00 to $90.00 per five-gallon pail.

It is anticipated that some areas may require excavation of contaminated soils beneath parking areas, greenspace, and / or building footprints. Excavation, loading, hauling, disposal, and adding new clean fill costs may range from approximately $24,000 to $98,000 depending on the volume of soil that needs to be removed. These figures were based on 740 cubic yards and 3000 cubic yards of contaminated material. A more definitive answer can be provided once the RAP is completed.

Project Budget: Total - $1,032,000

Completed:

Hazardous materials testing and abatement, and building removal = $ 11,000 (City)

Phase I and Phase II = $154,000 (EPA)

Phase I and Phase II report review by MPCA = $ 1,000 (City)

Grant Application (writer fee) to Deed Contamination Cleanup and Investigation Grant Program (for Response Action Plan) = $ 1,000 (City)

In-process/Pending:

Title work = $ 10,000 (City)

Grant Application to Deed Contamination Cleanup and Investigation Grant Program (for Response Action Plan) = $6,000 (City), $ 44,002 (DEED)

Preliminary and final plat = $ 10,000 (City)

Pending based on funding requests:

Cleanup - soil removal, disposal, clean fill = $ 25,000 (City), $ 73,000 (DEED)

Cleanup - passive vapor barrier = $ 95,000 (Captial Budget)

Construction design = $ 42,000 (Captial Budget)

Construction contract = $268,000 (Capital Budget), $250,000 (IRRRB)

Construction observation = $ 42,000 (Captial Budget)

Key Funding Sources:

City - $64,000; EPA - $154,000; IRRRB - $250,000; DEED - $117,000; Capital Budget Request - $447,000

Project Rationale

This project is needed to clean up a historically industrial blighted brownfield site and to make land available for development with the City. Without the City's action and the assistance of various partners, this property would remain the status quo. This property is located at the intersection of two major roadways in the City providing businesses with easy access in and out of the properties.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of Eveleth owns the properties and will own them through brownfield cleanup, redevelopment, and title clean-up. It is the City's intention to then lease or sell the properties to private business entities for business retention and business development.

Who will operate the facility?

Who will use or occupy this space?

Current land license with a contractor. Property can be leased (licensed) until the title work is complete.

Public Purpose

Economic Development

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jackie Monahan-Junek
City Administrator
218-744-7563

jackie@evelethmn.com

($ in thousands)

Eveleth Alice/Fayal Location Site Redevelopment - Brownfield Cleanup and Infrastructure

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$447	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$64	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$154	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$367	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,032**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$42	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$42	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$948	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,032**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Grand Rapids, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Mississippi River Pedestrian Bridge	1	GO	$ 750	$ 0	$ 0
Improvements to the Itasca Recreation Association Civic Center	2	GO	$ 2,025	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,775	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,775	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Mississippi River Pedestrian Bridge

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$750
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$750,000 in state funds is requested to assist in the design and construction of the Mississippi River Pedestrian Bridge located in Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

Project Description

The proposed Mississippi River Pedestrian Bridge will provide a necessary alternate route to the TH 169 vehicle bridge for pedestrians and bicycles. The bridge will be located ¼ mile east of the US TH 169 bridge over the Mississippi River. With the good structural condition of both existing vehicular bridges and the limited right-of-way on both corridors, the potential to create a “complete street” with a safe pedestrian environment is non-existent. In addition, the bridge connects to the existing trail systems on each side of the river giving residents and visitors a safe way to access the City’s facilities and amenities on either side of the river. Support for this bridge was developed from the 2009 update of the City’s Riverfront Framework Plan. Securing 2016 state funding is critical in this year’s solicitation so that the funds may be leveraged against the already secured 2016 federal TE funds for the project.

Project Rationale

The City of Grand Rapids has been developing a comprehensive multi-use pedestrian trail network throughout the City for the past twelve years. The river and the bridges have become a barrier for pedestrians and the promotion of a healthy community. Within the city core there are two vehicular bridges that cross the Mississippi River, but both have narrow sidewalks and no room for bicycles to cross the river safely. The Comprehensive Complete Streets Plan for Grand Rapids, federally funded and prepared by MnDOT, recommends the City “provide alternative routes to provide safe and convenient river crossing for all modes of travel”. A “Complete street” design, with a safe pedestrian environment, was not a feasible option for MnDOT during the recent TH 169 reconstruction project because of limited public right-of-way, structural condition of the bridge, and high vehicle per day counts. The MnDOT Project Memorandum for the reconstruction of TH 169 from 1st Street to 10th Street stated that “the proposed cross section is not desirable for bicycles”. MnDOT justified not accommodating for bicycles by recommending a parallel city street be used as an alternate route. The alternate route does not account for crossing the river and requires a new bridge. Additionally, the City's Comprehensive Plan recommends continuing to “Strive to become a Walkable City” and “Promote bicycling for commuters and recreational riders”. Without the Mississippi Riverfront Pedestrian Bridge, the ability for the City's to reach many of its comprehensive goals is limited. It is critical to obtain funding in 2016 so the $296,696 in already secured federal TE funds are not forfeited.

Other Considerations

The Grand Rapids Mississippi Riverfront Pedestrian Bridge will connect people and the outdoors by

creating a safe opportunity to experience the attractive natural features of the Grand Rapids Riverfront. The Pedestrian Bridge will connect to the existing City of Grand Rapids Trail System which includes over 60 miles of non-motorized access to pedestrians and bicyclists. From the City's Trail system, users can link to several other regional, state, and national trails. Grand Rapids serves as the western most gateway community to the regional Mesabi Trail. This trail, when completed, will traverse 132 miles and connect more than 25 communities. Additionally, MnDOT recently completed the local section of the Mississippi River Trail (MRT), the State's first US Bike Route. The MRT runs right through Grand Rapids providing avid cyclists and outdoor enthusiasts access to a host of recreational activities within the City. Hikers can connect to the North Country Trail (NCT) and gain access to the rugged, natural beauty of the longest National Scenic Trail in the nation. The NCT will be 4,600 miles long when complete and passes through 12 National Forests.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Grand Rapids

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Grand Rapids

Who will use or occupy this space?

None.

Public Purpose

To provide a safe alternative for pedestrians to cross the Mississipi River in the absence of being able to utilize TH 169.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In 2010, under Chapter 189, Subdivision 7, paragraph (b), the City received $900,000 for rail crossing safety improvements.

Project Contact Person

Julie Kennedy, P.E.
City Engineer
218-326-7625
jkennedy@ci.grand-rapids.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Mississippi River Pedestrian Bridge

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$750	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$0	$297	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$453	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$10	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$108	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$24	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,343	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$15	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Improvements to the Itasca Recreation Association Civic Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,025
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$2,025,000 in state funds is requested to make improvements at the Itasca Recreation Association Civic Center. Projects include replacing a refrigeration system, replacing a dehumidification system, installing an elevator to make the facility ADA compliant, renovating the upper lobby, and constructing an addition to the east venue.

Project Description

In 2020 the production and importation of R-22 refrigerant in the U.S. will be halted due to its high ozone depleting potential. Knowing this, we had Stevens Engineering develop a plan to replace our existing R-22 refrigeration system in our West Rink, which was built in 1967. Their recommendation is to connect the West Rink floor to the ammonia-based refrigeration system in the East Rink which was built in 1995. Serving two rink floors from one common refrigeration system is the most efficient type of operation. This will require adding cooling capacity to the existing ammonia-based system and replacing the rink floor in the West Rink.

Our existing dehumidification system was installed in 1992 and is under-sized to perform the demands of year-round ice. At the time the system was installed, ice was only put in for two weeks during the summer. To add to the problem, the manufacturer has since gone out of business making parts extremely difficult to find and very expensive. As the trend in ice sports has moved towards skating year-round, a new dehumidification system is essential for the facility to remain viable during the summer months.

We have made great strides in improving the ADA accessibility in our facility over the past two years installing automated entrances and remodeling restrooms to meet current ADA standards. Unfortunately, having two-levels within the facility, a person confined to a wheelchair must currently go outside to move from one level to the other. The construction of an elevator would eliminate this inconvenience and make our entire facility ADA accessible.

In 1980 an addition was built onto the south end of the Civic Center to provide additional locker rooms and a large upper lobby that provided an enclosed viewing area and large concession stand. In 1995 a second sheet of ice was added to the facility which included a new lobby area and concession stand which now serves as the primary concessions for the facility. Remodeling the upper lobby would allow us to reduce the size of the old concession stand making the space marketable for larger meetings, banquets and receptions.

When the east venue was constructed in 1995, an enclosed viewing area and banquet facilities were cut from the project to meet budget. With hockey tournaments now accounting for a huge portion of our local tourism dollars during the winter months, we feel offering an improved overall experience while at our facility is imperative. Offering an enclosed viewing area of our east rink and having banquet facilities to host events for visiting teams would ensure continued growth of our tournaments.

Project Rationale

The EPA's phase out of the refrigerant R-22 in the year 2020 has prompted us as well as many other ice arenas across the state to retrofit or replace their existing cooling systems. As we assessed this requirement we began to consider other needs in our aging facility. Our undersized dehumidification system cannot handle the demands of year-round ice and has become extremely difficult to find parts for as the manufacturer is no longer in business. An elevator would make our facility fully accessible as currently people in wheel chairs need to go outside to move from our upper lobby to our main floor. Renovating our upper lobby and constructing an addition to the east venue would add marketable banquet/meeting space as well as improve the viewing experience for those traveling to Grand Rapids for hockey tournaments.

Other Considerations

In February, 2015 the University of Minnesota Tourism Center completed a year-long economic impact study of the IRA Civic Center. The study estimated $3.4 million in gross output of economic impact to the Itasca County economy on an annual basis from IRA Civic Center. Of the $3.4 million, $2.2 million is associated with visitor spending in the area while on day and overnight trips and $1.2 million is associated with the annual operation of the Civic Center facility and its effects in the local economy.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The project will increase revenues within the Civic Center's enterprise fund budget while expenditures are expected to remain unchanged. No additional state operating dollars will be requested.

Who will own the facility?

City of Grand Rapids

Who will operate the facility?

City of Grand Rapids

Who will use or occupy this space?

The facility is used in an ice skating capacity by youth hockey organizations, figure skating clubs, private hockey groups, and private tournaments. It is also used by many private entities for trade

shows, a variety of performances, receptions, banquets, and meetings.

Public Purpose

The facility hosts many non-profit gatherings, walks/runs, benefits, community health events, and serves as an emergency shelter for our our community. The facility also serves as the home to several school district activities including boys and girls high school hockey, graduation ceremony, dances, kindergarten round-up, and the college fair. It also serves as the emergency evacuation site for Grand Rapids High School and is also part of the Itasca County Emergency Management Plan.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In 2010, under Chapter 189, Subdivision 7, paragraph (b), the City received $900,000 for rail crossing safety improvements.

Project Contact Person

Dale Anderson
Director of Parks and Recreation
218-326-2500
danderson@cityofgrandrapidsmn.com

($ in thousands)

Improvements to the Itasca Recreation Association Civic Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,025	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Funding	$0	$2,305	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,330**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$590	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$3,208	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$35	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$498	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,331**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Hallock, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Columbus Ave Sewer	1	GO	$ 700	$ 0	$ 0
Fire Hall	1	GO	$ 273	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 973	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 973	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Columbus Ave Sewer

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$700
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The sanitary sewer main under Columbus Ave, Hallock is deteriorating and needs repair.

Project Description

We have created a city wide sewer facilities plan and have applied for funding with the PFA. The total projected cost is $1.534M, which would be funded with a GO bonds grant from the state and the PFA with the remaining amount covered by the City of Hallock. The cost included removal and replacement of the deteriorating vitrified clay pipe as well as the attached manholes and service connections. The design and bidding will be completed in summer/fall 2015 with the project construction starting in spring 2016.

Project Rationale

This is needed in order to prevent a shutdown of our city's sanitary sewer system. This is a large expense for our sewer utility.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This will potentially save the city $100,000 per year over the next 20 years.

Who will own the facility?

City of Hallock

Who will operate the facility?

City of Hallock

Who will use or occupy this space?

No private use

Public Purpose

Sanitary sewer

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Ryan Evenson
City Administrator/Clerk
218-843-2737
revenson@hallockmn.org

($ in thousands)

Columbus Ave Sewer

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$700	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$700**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$228	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,306	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$75	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,609**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Fire Hall

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$273
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Build a new fire hall with a total cost of $439,000.

Project Description

Our existing fire hall has exceeded it's useful life. As our fire department has grown and changed to meet the needs of our community, we have run out of space in our almost 50 year old building. When the department receives an emergency call, we often have to move vehicles out of the way to get to the correct rescue vehicle. The precious seconds lost can potentially result in lost property and lost lives. Total construction is estimated to be $439,000. Funding in addition to the dollars received here will be in the form of a CIP bond as well as $166,000 from cash reserves. The city already owns the land in question. This small project will have a large impact on the emergency services response in our city and our county.

Project Rationale

The fire department has run out of room in the existing location. We have vehicles parked at various locations and outdoors, which causes potential lost response time.

Other Considerations

We have considered an addition as opposed to a new building. This idea was decided to not be feasible due to the location of the building and the lack of adjacent land for expansion.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

A projected CIP bond as an alternative would cost the City of Hallock approximately $39,233 per year over the next 15 years.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Hallock

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Hallock

Who will use or occupy this space?

NA

Public Purpose

Fire Department

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Ryan Evenson
City Administrator
218-843-2737
revenson@hallockmn.org

($ in thousands)

Fire Hall

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$273	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$166	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$439**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$439	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$439**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Regional Medical Examiner's Facility	1	GO	$ 25,932	$ 0	$ 0
Hennepin/Ramsey Joint Juvenile Facility	2	GO	$ 18,677	$ 0	$ 0
Interstate 35W/CSAH 3 (Lake Street) Transit/Access Project	3	GO	$ 25,000	$ 0	$ 0
ArtSpace Hennepin Center for the Arts	4	GO	$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
Cedar Cultural Center	5	GO	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 78,609	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 78,609	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Regional Medical Examiner's Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$25,932
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Construct a 67,000 SF regional, state of the art medical examiner's facility for Dakota, Hennepin, and Scott Counties with the flexibility to accommodate future partner counties and agencies.

Project Description

This project proposes the development of a 67,000 square foot state-of-the-art medical examiner facility to support projected population growth within the current regional service area over the next 25 years as well as potential growth for expanding regional services for additional counties and entities under contractual and/or joint powers agreements. As such, this facility will be planned for phased implementation with future expansion capability. Furthermore, the facility will be built at a location that best supports access needs for the three founding counties and reasonable scene response times for a growing geographic service area.

Project Rationale

According to state statute, counties in Minnesota are required to provide for coroner/medical examiner services. A 2006 statutory change raised the qualifications of those who serve that role and has resulted in an increased number of counties seeking partnerships for medical examiner services. Technology advancements have allowed for service boundaries to expand, creating opportunities to more efficiently utilize resources and effectively respond to the needs of a larger area.

Dakota, Hennepin, and Scott Counties are committed to the development of a regional medical examiner's office business plan and that will provide high quality, cost-effective, state-of-the-art forensic death investigation and autopsy services. In January 2013, the three counties, recognizing opportunities for efficiencies and excellence in service, staffing, and educating future medical professionals, decided to join forces. The result has been more flexibility in service and positive outcomes for the counties. The next step is to construct a facility that can take the service model to the next level of excellence and potentially serve a wider area.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Hennepin County

Who will operate the facility?

Hennepin County

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

To provide effecient and effective medical examiner services on a regional basis.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Dr. Andrew Baker
Chief Medical Examiner
612-215-6312
andrew.baker@hennepin.us

($ in thousands)

Regional Medical Examiner's Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$25,932	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$750	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$25,183	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$750**	**$51,115**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$750	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,680	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$41,263	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$7,172	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$750**	**$51,115**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Hennepin/Ramsey Joint Juvenile Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$18,677
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	Construct a new 100 bed joint Hennepin/Ramsey juvenile corrections facility.

Project Description

A shared 100 bed facility of roughly 60-90,000 square feet will be constructed on a site that is convenient to serve the populations of both Ramsey and Hennepin counties. By pooling existing resources, both counties can fill gaps in existing services leading to an expansion and effectiveness of services. The increase in service options will keep more youth closer to home, as some are currently sent out of county when there is a gap in existing programming options. The additional programming and decreasing the likelihood that children are sent out of county for services will likely result in reduced recidivism further reducing cost and improving the lives of youth the programs are designed to serve.

Project Rationale

Ramsey and Hennepin counties recognize the many program benefits and efficiencies that will be gained by consolidating programs and facilities. Both currently operate residential treatment centers that provide services to youth based on Evidenced Based Practices which concludes that the best approach to successfully serving youth with delinquencies is to limit the practice of removing youth from their families and homes, and providing risk/needs-based services within their communities. For youth whose risk and needs are best addressed by removal from the home, the evidence indicates that the residential placement approach should be based on Evidenced Based Practice principles. This approach has significantly reduced the needed residential demand- creating large vacancies at both treatment centers.

The existing facility layouts in both institutions are not functional by today's standards, have numerous accessibility issues, and are not conducive to providing proper care and confinement of youth. Both institutions have antiquated designs that demand inefficient deployment of staff, which poses additional challenges to maintaining safety and security on these campuses. The number of staff required to maintain safety hinders the overall effective implementation of services because it unduly tilts the staff resource balance toward security and away from treatment interventions. In each case, the buildings used to house youth and programming are aging and require significant on-going preservation and maintenance efforts.

The joint facility collaboration between Hennepin and Ramsey counties will be beneficial to the youth and families served and a cost effective solution for taxpayers to address the needs of juvenile treatment programs.

Other Considerations

Operational costs will decline with a joint facility serving both counties. Improved staff efficiency, the creation of a new energy-efficient building, and the benefits of economies of scale will actualize efficiencies with a smaller overall footprint.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Hennepin and/or Ramsey County.

Who will operate the facility?

Hennepin and/or Ramsey County.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Provide residential correctional treatment for at risk youth in Hennepin and Ramsey counties.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Mark Thompson
Assistant County Administrator for Public Safety & Judiciary
612-348-9050
Mark.Thompson@hennepin.us

($ in thousands)

Hennepin/Ramsey Joint Juvenile Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$18,677	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$18,677	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$37,354**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$32,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$5,354	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$37,354**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Interstate 35W/CSAH 3 (Lake Street) Transit/Access Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$25,000
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	$25 million in state funds are requested to complete the design; purchase right of way; construct exit ramps from and reconstruct local streets in the vicinity of I-35W; and, construct a quality pedestrian/bicycle connection between Lake Street and the Midtown Greenway, all in conjunction with the I-35W Transit/Access Project located at Lake Street in South Minneapolis.

Project Description

The I-35W-Lake Street Transit/Access Project addresses the Lake Street interchange area between approximately 32nd Street and 28th Street. A new transit station is the heart of this project, providing a hub for local busses on Lake Street and for BRT above Lake Street in-line with the freeway. This project, estimated to cost $150.2 million and planned for 2017 construction includes:

- Full rehabilitation of freeway, ramps, and some sections of local streets and sidewalks immediately adjacent to the freeway
- Orange Line BRT station at Lake Street
- New bridges at 31st Street, Lake Street, Midtown Greenway, and 28th Street
- High-quality bicycle/pedestrian connection between Lake Street and the Midtown Greenway, including connectivity to potential future rail transit service along the Midtown Greenway
- Noise walls and retaining walls
- New exit ramp at Lake Street from southbound I-35W
- New exit ramp from northbound I-35W to 28th Street

Project Rationale

The I-35W corridor is identified as a transitway (Metro Orange Line) in the regionally adopted long-range transportation plan. The Lake Street multimodal station in the middle of I-35W is the keystone, providing critical local connections to bus rapid transit (BRT).

Construction of a high-quality off-street pedestrian/bicycle connection between the Midtown Greenway, located in the trench of a former freight rail corridor; and the new transit station is necessary to eliminate the barrier presented by the trench, eliminating excess intersection crossings, and reducing the travel distance for pedestrians and bicyclists wishing to connect to the Orange Line via the Midtown Greenway.

Construction of a new southbound exit ramp from I-35W to Lake Street with an auxiliary lane

extension from southbound I-35W provides both improved regional connectivity to the Lake Street area and better overall operation of the interstate while serving much higher demands along I-35W.

Construction of a new northbound exit ramp to 28th Street provides both an operation and safety benefit to the interstate and improved regional connectivity to the Lake Street area which serves South Minneapolis residential and employment destinations in the adjoining neighborhoods.

Other Considerations

The widening of I-35W to accommodate the Lake Street multimodal station in the middle of I-35W will necessitate the removal of the 2nd Avenue link between Lake Street and 28th Street and will cause significant rerouting of exiting northbound I-35W traffic now destined for 28th Street via 2nd Avenue. The introduction of the northbound I-35W exit to 28th Street will keep the regional traffic on the interstate where it belongs.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The introduction of the two proposed I-35W exits will include auxiliary lanes and exit ramps that MnDOT will have to plow during the winter. This modest increase in lane miles requiring snow clearance should not require any additional snow plows to the existing fleet. The only additional cost to be incurred by MnDOT would be affiliated with the extra salt used during plowing. This increase will be imperceptible in terms of total salt placed along I-35W.

Who will own the facility?

MnDOT will “own” the auxiliary lanes and exit ramps affiliated with the two interstate exits. The county and city will continue to own the local streets, and connection between the Midtown Greenway and Lake Street constructed under the project. Metro Transit will own the Lake Street multimodal station constructed under the project (but not funded by this request).

Who will operate the facility?

MnDOT will operate the auxiliary lanes and exit ramps affiliated with the two interstate exits. The county and city will operate the local streets reconstructed, and the connection between the Midtown Greenway and Lake Street constructed under the project. Metro Transit will operate the Lake Street multimodal station constructed under the project (but not funded by this request).

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Exit ramps from I-35W for regional access to destinations and local street reconstruction to accommodate the Lake Street multimodal station.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Debra Brisk
Assistant County Administrator- Public Works
Debra.Brisk@hennepin.us

($ in thousands)

Interstate 35W/CSAH 3 (Lake Street) Transit/Access Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$25,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$3,693	$0	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$10,424	$8,100	$0	$0
City Funds	$1,376	$0	$0	$0
County Funds	$1,479	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$100,460	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$6,355	$0	$0
County Funds	$0	$6,355	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$16,972**	**$146,270**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$3,600	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$13,042	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$3,930	$7,862	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$134,808	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$16,972**	**$146,270**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Yes
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

ArtSpace Hennepin Center for the Arts

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,000
Priority Ranking:	4
Project Summary:	This request is for $6 million in state funding for capital improvements and asset preservation that will fully rehabilitate and restore the eight story Hennepin Center for the Arts building which is part of the newly completed Cowles Center for Dance and the Performing Arts in Downtown Minneapolis in Hennepin County.

Project Description

Artspace is ready to initiate the work on the Hennepin Center for the Arts if awarded $6.0 million in state funds.Artspace estimates that as many as 95 people could be employed during the construction peroid. The Cowles Center, along with more than 120 nonprofits who call the Cowles home, employ nearly 100 people in full and parttime positions annually.

Project Rationale

In 2009, with the help of US Representative Ellison (MN-5th), Artspace secured a $240,000 Federal Earmark from the Department of Interior's Save America's Treasures budget to begin work on restoring this significant historic structure in downtown Minneapolis; we also received a Small Grant ($7,000) from the Minnesota Historical Society to help complete this work. Work to be completed includes: 1) a new roof and gutters, the existing ones having failed past the point of temporary repair; 2) brick work, a result of leaking gutters that are contributing to brick staining and degradation; 3) replacement of the two cupolas (onion domes) at the corners of the building along the 6th Street side of the building, including replacement and restoration of the decorative flashing along the entire roof-line connecting them; 4) decorative finials and cornices are rusting and degrading rapidly and in need of replacement or restoration; 5) street front façade upgrades to historic storefront replacing the inadequate mid-1960s renovation; 6) stone and brick cleaning of entire building; 7) stone replacement along sidewalk and at entrances (may require Dutchmen style replacement); 8) historic door replacement at the main entrance.

As noted, this building is part of a newly created three building complex: The Cowles Center. In 2009 the $45 million capital campaign to begin the project was completed and the Center opened in 2011. However, because of an undisclosed abandoned well and associated soils that were contaminated (undetectable through common methods of measurement), the building's entire $3,000,000 contingency was depleted. Artspace was forced to abandon its plans to make the necessary repairs to the Hennepin Center for the Arts building and focus instead on restoration of the Shubert Theater (another part of the complex) and construction of the new atrium. Only minor improvements were made to the Hennepin Center for the Arts building.

The Hennepin Center for the Arts building (formerly known as Historic Masonic Temple) is the nerve center of the complex and arguably the most important building in that it houses nearly 30 dance and

music organizations and other non-profits that serve all of Minnesota, not just the Twin Cities. Many of these groups participate in the Cowles Center's Distance Learning Program, which provides free arts education programs to Minnesota schools all across the state, giving children even in the remotest parts of the state exposure to world-class arts instruction. In most cases these are experiences that their own schools do not offer due to financial constraints and distance. This program has been in service since 2002 and has even branched out to instruct the disabled or elderly in the state.

Beyond its contribution to statewide arts education and arts programming the Historic Masonic Temple, built in 1888, is renowned as one of the finest examples of Richardsonian Romanesque buildings still standing; it was developed by Long & Kees, a local firm, responsible for some of Minneapolis' other finest historic buildings, including City Hall, the Lumber Exchange, and the Flour Exchange. All of them, like the Historic Masonic Temple, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Historic Masonic Temple is approximately 100,000 sq.ft., and is the anchor building to the Cowles Center which is comprised of three buildings: The Cowles (frmr. Shubert) Theater, the USBank Atrium, and the Masonic Temple. The three buildings viewed together give the Cowles Center roughly 150,000 sq.ft of performance, rehearsal, administrative, and education space.

No new square footage will be added as a result of this effort. This request is for asset preservation only; work to be completed will ensure the soundness of the building's structural integrity with some cosmetic enhancements to bring the building into compliance with historic preservation standards. The MN-State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) will supervise work.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Artspace has a long-standing track record of proven successful public/private partnerships. Their good reputation is owed, in large part, to their unbroken promise that once a building is placed into service they do not return seeking operational support. Rather, very carefully constructed operating proformas, strong management/oversight at each facility, and plans for cash reserves in each building allow them to solve many problems internally as an organization. Given these circumstances, and the fact that the building is already in operation, we do not believe that any new or additional state operating dollars will be requested.

Who will own the facility?

Artspace Projects of Minneapolis currently owns and operates the Hennepin Center for the Arts as part of the recently completed Cowles Center and will continue to do so in perpetuity.

Who will operate the facility?

Artspace Projects

Who will use or occupy this space?

Hennepin Center for the Arts is home to more than 30 Minnesota arts organizations and nonprofits providing arts programming and free education to urban and rural schools throughout Minnesota. Current Tenants include: Aegis Foundation; ARENA Dances; Arquette & Associates; Arts ink, Inc.; Black Label Movement; Cowles Center for Dance and the Performing Arts; Data Raker; Dovetail Partners; DRD Designs; Green T Productions; Italian Cultural Center; Illusion Theater; James Sewell Ballet; John D. Gross Commercial Real Estate Development; Minnesota Chorale; Minnesota Concert Opera; Minnesota Dance Medicine; Minnesota Dance Theater and Dance Institute; Minnesota Pollution Control; Moves; National Lutheran Choir; Tom Nordyke; One Roof; Screenwriters Workshop; Shapiro and Smith Dance; The Singers; Stuart Pimsler; Twin Cities Gay Men's Chorus; VSA Minnesota; Zenon Dance Company and Dance School.

Public Purpose

Rehabilitate a national landmark building serving as the home to multiple nonprofit organizations serving the public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

2005 Capital Investment Bill: $1,000,000 for planning and design work

2006 Capital Investment Bill: $11,000,000 for capital

2014 Capital Investment Bill: $550,000 ($300,000 for planning and design work/$250,000 for capital)

Project Contact Person

Stacy Mickelson
Artspace
612-810-1759
stacey.mickelson@artspace.org

($ in thousands)

ArtSpace Hennepin Center for the Arts

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Non-Governmental Funds	$1,250	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$1,750	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,250**	**$7,750**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$800	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$450	$7,750	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,250**	**$7,750**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Cedar Cultural Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	5
Project Summary:	Increase the capacity, ensure sustainability and enhance the experience at the Cedar Cultural Center.

Project Description

The invesmtent will:

- **Increase capacity** via enhanced efficiency, flexible performance and teaching space, and an expanded outdoor performance area.
- ***Ensure sustainability*** through long-term maintenance projects and improving revenue-producing space.
- ***Enhance The Cedar experience*** with improved sound and lighting, expanded and accessible bathrooms, and increased food options in order to attract more performers and patrons.

Project Rationale

The Cedar is an anchor nonprofit organization in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood -- located at the center of the commercial and residential hub of the most densely populated neighborhood in Minnesota. The neighborhood, which is adjacent to ***downtown Minneapolis*** and the new Vikings Stadium, has a significant number of affordable housing units due to the iconic Riverside Plaza towers, and its proximity to ***Augsburg College*** and the ***University of Minnesota***. Riverside Plaza houses over 5,000 residents alone, largely refugees and immigrants who fled civil war in ***Somalia*** and began settling in Minneapolis in the 1990s.

After 25+ years operating in a 1940s-era building, The Cedar Board of Directors has authorized a $***7 million capital investment*** to support program development, increased access, and infrastructure expansion in order to:

- Meet the growing demand for The Cedar's programs and performances;
- Maximize live music access and opportunities for Minnesota students, and
- Expand access to cultural and community-based performances.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Who will operate the facility?

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rob Simonds
Executive Director
612-338-2674
rsimonds@thecedar.org

($ in thousands)

Cedar Cultural Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$4,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Bottineau LRT (Metro Blue Line extension)	1	GO	$ 20,000	$ 79,000	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 20,000	$ 79,000	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 20,000	$ 79,000	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Bottineau LRT (Metro Blue Line extension)

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$20,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $20 million in state funding for preliminary engineering and/or final design activities for the METRO Blue Line Extension.

Project Description

The METRO Blue Line Extension (BLRT) project is a 13 mile extension of the existing METRO Blue Line with up to 11 new stations. The current total budget is nearly $1 billion. It is anticipated that 49 percent of the funds will come through the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts Program with the remaining funding coming from the Counties Transit Improvement Board (31 percent), the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (10 percent), and the State of Minnesota (10 percent). Nearly 27,000 weekday boardings are anticipated in 2030. Numbers will be updated as the Project Development activities advance.

Project Rationale

The METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau LRT) project extends between Downtown and North Minneapolis through the Northwest Suburbs of the Twin Cities serving; Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. This will provide an attractive travel option for those accessing jobs in Downtown Minneapolis, as well as suburban jobs in the Northwest region. The project will result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions and oil dependency, as well as increased mobility and development densities.

The METRO Blue Line Extension (BLRT) connects with existing and future transit system investments in Downtown Minneapolis. The BLRT investment will be integrated into the existing Metro Blue Line (Hiawatha LRT) at Target Field Station. This will provide convenient connections from the Northwest region to the following Twin Cities Transitway Facilities:

- METRO Blue Line (in operation since 2004)
- Northstar Commuter Rail (in operation since November 2009)
- METRO Green Line (Central Corridor)(in operation since 2014)
- METRO Red Line (Cedar Ave BRT)(in operation since 2014)
- METRO Green Line Extension (Southwest LRT) (Preliminary engineering in progress)
- METRO Orange Line (I-35W BRT) (Project Development in progress)

High Transit Market Potential; Serves a variety of transit markets including:

- High concentrations of transit dependent people
- Fully developed suburbs facing the challenges of redevelopment
- Growing suburban communities including large development tracts
- Institutions including a medical center and two college campuses, large scale commercial development including the Target North Corporate Campus
- Theodore Wirth Regional Park
- Target Field Station

Other Considerations

An estimated 2,500 construction workers will be needed to build the line, with $300 million estimated construction payroll.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

It is anticipated that 50 percent of the operating costs (after fare box recovery) would be paid by the Counties Transit Improvement Board and 50 percent from the Metropolitan Council. The Metropolitan Council portion is estimated to be in the $8-9 million range in 2021.

Who will own the facility?

Metropolitan Council

Who will operate the facility?

Metropolitan Council

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Mobility, Access to jobs, education, health care, and recreational activities

Description of Previous Appropriations

$1 million in 2014 funding

Project Contact Person

Debra Brisk

Executive Deputy Director for the HCRRA
612-348-3406
Debra.Brisk@hennepin.us

($ in thousands)

Bottineau LRT (Metro Blue Line extension)

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$20,000	$79,000	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$1,000	$0	$0	$0
County Funds	$18,400	$0	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$27,600	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$490,000	$0
County Funds	$0	$11,600	$70,000	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$47,400	$235,000	$0
TOTAL	**$47,000**	**$79,000**	**$874,000**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$5,000	$21,000	$32,000	$0
Predesign Fees	$42,000	$48,000	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$10,000	$51,000	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$651,000	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$140,000	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$47,000**	**$79,000**	**$874,000**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Yes
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Hermantown, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Arrowhead Regional Health and Wellness Center	1	GO	$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Arrowhead Regional Health and Wellness Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The Arrowhead Regional Health and Wellness Center (ARHWC) is a community focused facility to be built and owned by the City of Hermantown and operated by the YMCA. A budget of $16 million has been established for the 71,000 square foot facility and is predicated on the adaptive reuse of the Hermantown Middle School building and 11 acre site with existing sports fields, parking, and utilities. Approximately half of the total useable area of the building will be open to the general public with community based and health care uses and the remaining half of the facility as a fully functioning YMCA, which will bear the operational expenses through its, subtenant leases, memberships and programs.

Project Description

The ARHWC will be a $16 million facility consisting of a 71,000 square foot building on 11 acres of land at the corner of Ugstad and Arrowhead roads on the current Hermantown Middle School site. Amenities will include:

- A top notch aquatics center as the cornerstone for the facility
- Modern fitness facilities with gymnasium, running track, and racquetball
- Locker rooms accommodating adults, all-ages, families, and special needs
- Fully licensed daycare
- Teens and Seniors Center
- Community Education facility
- Multipurpose community center with Café
- Healthcare system providing programs and services focused on preventative health including; Physical therapy, Dietetics and Health Education
- Large lobby linking uses into a “Main Street” and acting as a public amenity.

A key decision in the predesign process that allows the facility to maximize the budget was the reuse of specific portions of the existing middle school in Hermantown. Slated for demolition at the end of the school year in May of 2016, the middle school facility and site was the top choice in the site selection process. The existing 1992 classroom addition and gymnasium provide 26,000 square feet of reusable public building infrastructure that can be remodeled at a fraction of the cost to build new. This also reduces the cost of demolition, disposal, energy, and materials for new construction. The savings to the project conservatively equates to $100 per square foot or roughly $2,500,000.

The Arrowhead Regional Health and Wellness Center will be owned by the City of Hermantown and operated by the YMCA as a single tenant. Operational partnerships through sublease agreements between the YMCA and regional healthcare and community education providers will reach the diverse demographics of Saint Louis County. The project has broad support with endorsements from regional businesses, St. Louis County, the City of Hermantown, the City of Proctor, and 15 surrounding Townships. A population base of over 50,000 will be served through this facility with expanding reach for regional events and activities. The ARHWC will help Saint Louis County make a strong turn-around in health outcomes. The partnerships between the State, County, City, Townships, private sector operators, and capital campaign donors are overwhelmingly strong and will continue to grow with the potential that this project will bring to building a healthy and thriving Saint Louis County Community.

Project Rationale

The Arrowhead Regional Health and Wellness Center facility project is being developed to address the negatively trending health statistics for St. Louis County.

Health Needs Assessments commissioned by St. Louis County Health Department, Essentia Health, and St. Luke's consistently concluded that despite great access to healthcare (ranking 7th in the State), the health outcomes affecting length and quality of life for this region are concerning with a ranking of 75th of 87 Counties in Minnesota. The facility will consist of multiple amenities in one location to foster preventative health and wellness, community connectivity, and health education and services throughout southern St. Louis County. Negotiations with local healthcare, community service organizations, and the School District are in process to solidify the programming that will make this facility a catalyst for change to improve the overall health of St. Louis County's residents.

Other Considerations

none

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The facility will be fully operated by the YMCA and will require no operations budgeting by the City. The YMCA has allocated funds in its pro forma for the operations costs of the facility, including long term maintenance and replacement. This will be overseen by the Advisory Board for the facility as a sub-committee to the Duluth Area YMCA Board of Directors.

Who will own the facility?

City of Hermantown

Who will operate the facility?

YMCA

Who will use or occupy this space?

YMCA will be the sole tenant to the City. All other users will be subtenants to the YMCA including

healthcare systems, community service organizations, and food service providers.

Public Purpose

To provide a community based health and wellness facility to proactively combat the negative trending health outcomes identified in the Community Health Needs Assessments commissioned by St. Louis County, Essentia Health, and St. Luke's.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The State of Minnesota awarded $250,000 in 2014 to the City of Hermantown to prepare the Pre-Design Report. The City awarded the Pre-Design services contract to LHB, who conducted community outreach, space needs programming, site analysis and selection, conceptual site master planning, conceptual building design, and budgeting.

Project Contact Person

John Mulder
City Administrator
218-729-3600
jmulder@hermantownmn.com

($ in thousands)

Arrowhead Regional Health and Wellness Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$8,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$9,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$923	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$776	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$14,101	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$300	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$170	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$730	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Yes
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Hibbing Public School District — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Hibbing High School Auditorium Restoration	1	GO	$ 2,300	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,300	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,300	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Hibbing High School Auditorium Restoration

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,300
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Independent School District No. 701 – Hibbing is requesting $2.3 million in state funds for capital improvements and restoration of the Hibbing High School Auditorium.

Project Description

The total estimated project cost is $2,550,000. Key funding sources are a $250,000 Minnesota Historical Society Grant and this $2,300,000 bond request. The District has invested $15,000,000 into the high school facility since 2006, including a new auditorium roof membrane, auditorium dressing rooms to accommodate accessibility, and a ventilation system upgrade to meet current Indoor Air Quality standards.

The scope of the work includes refurbishing auditorium seating and painting, cleaning and restoration of existing walls, ceilings, historic detailing and artwork. Stage rigging is original counter balancing and is in need of replacement to meet current operational needs as well as safety standards. New stage lighting and dimming will be replaced to meet the current performance requirements and provide energy efficiency to meet current energy conservation guidelines.

The existing high school facility is 352,000 square feet with the centerpiece, the historic auditorium and support space, totaling 23,300 square feet.

The sound system will be upgraded to enhance the acoustical performance of the space. The current choral and band will be replaced with acoustical performance riser and shell system. Due to the current accessibility requirements of Americans with Disabilities Act, the main stage access will be modified to accommodate all occupants accessing the stage.

Maintenance and renovation costs at Hibbing High School are larger than many public schools because of the high quality materials used in our school. Plaster molds found throughout the walls and ceiling areas are very ornate and detailed, light fixtures are all custom design, and other historic building details such as the stain glass exit signs must be maintained to their original historic integrity.

Project Rationale

Hibbing High School was constructed in 1920 with a total of 352,000 square feet, covering five floors

in the educational wing and our grand auditorium. This building is listed on the National Registry of Historic Buildings.

The building is well preserved with great care taken by the district and the community. Over the past 10 years, the restoration and improvement projects throughout the building have totaled more than $15,000,000. Although many larger scale projects at Hibbing High School have been completed already, the auditorium is in need of restoration and several upgrades with a project value of $2,550,000.

Our auditorium serves the local students and our community with many public events including theatrical and choral performances, community dance recitals, and community education sponsored events. Serving a larger geographical area, the Hibbing High School Auditorium provides a regional setting for cultural productions, including performances by the Minnesota Symphony Orchestra, the Boston Pops Orchestra, the United States Naval Band, the Guthrie Theater, Garrison Keillor, and Minnesota Public Radio remote broadcasts.

Additional events held at the Hibbing High School Auditorium that have a statewide appeal include an actual Minnesota Supreme Court hearing where an active case was heard and presented in front of approximately 1,500 Iron Range students. The Hibbing High School collaborated with regional schools from throughout Northern Minnesota to gather at the Hibbing High School Auditorium. At the conclusion of the hearing, Supreme Court Justices spoke to the students and answered questions about the legal process. In addition, the Hibbing High School Auditorium has hosted larger United States political activities, including the John F. Kennedy presidential campaign and 1999 Minnesota Gubernatorial debate. The Hibbing High School Auditorium also annually hosts the Hibbing Community College commencement activities.

Hibbing High School has always been more than an educational facility serving our community, region and statewide public interests. The details in construction found mostly in the auditorium area make it like no other educational facility. This one of a kind building is worth the preservation efforts put forth for decades by our community. In the nearly 100-year-old facility, we are always working to maintain the excellence of the educational opportunities for students while maintaining the value the building serving our community, and the economical impact it provides in our region.

Other Considerations

Hibbing High School has been named the “Richest Gem in Minnesota’s Educational Crown”. Built in the early 1920s at of cost of nearly four million dollars, the school resembles a “medieval castle outlined against the sky”. A stroll down the long central hallway leads to semi-vaulted foyer opening into the greatest artistic treasure of this educational gem, the historic Hibbing High School Auditorium.

It is the town’s most recognizable feature and the pride of the community. Seating 1805 people, it has hosted numerous famous guests, including the Boston Pops Orchestra and John F. Kennedy, Jr.

The Hibbing High School auditorium is known for its elegant design. Unique hand-molded ceilings in

the foyer welcome visitors and accent the breathtaking auditorium designed after the Capitol Theatre in New York City. Cut-glass chandeliers of crystal, imported from Belgium, light the 1,800-velvet seat grand auditorium.

The 40'x 60' stage is framed by a 20'x 40' proscenium arch, which is bordered by large pillars. The "fly" area that holds the stage's backdrops rises 90 feet above the stage floor. In the past, there were 45 backdrops, most of which were installed and executed specifically for this auditorium by the Twin City Scenic Company.

The auditorium boasts a magnificent Barton pipe organ, one of only two that still exist in the United States. Containing over 1900 pipes, the organ can play any orchestra instrument except the violin.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Independent School District No. 701 operates and maintains the High School Auditorium, and would require no additional funding when the project is complete. It is our goal that the improvements made in the auditorium will lead to increased efficiencies and energy cost savings. The stage lighting in the Hibbing High School Auditorium is substantially all from original light fixtures serving the performance floor with large incandescent lamps, controlled by electric dimmers. New lighting technologies will dramatically improve the energy consumption and reliability in this equipment.

Who will own the facility?

Independent School District No. 701 – Hibbing

Who will operate the facility?

Independent School District No. 701 – Hibbing

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Hibbing High School Auditorium is occasionally rented to private parties for events such as weddings and dance recitals.

Public Purpose

The Hibbing High School Auditorium will continue to be used for students assemblies, choir and theatrical performances, band concerts, and will continue to host regional educational activities and community events. Past regional events include performances by the Minnesota Symphony Orchestra, Duluth-Superior Symphony Orchestra, United States Air Force Academy Band, Minnesota Public Radio, Minnesota Supreme Court, and the annual Hibbing Community College Commencement.

Description of Previous Appropriations

During the 2015 1st Special Session, the Minnesota Legislature passed the Omnibus Legacy

appropriations bill (SF0001), which appropriated funds for Independent School District No. 701 to receive a State Capital Projects Grant administered by the Minnesota Historical Society. This grant is for an amount up to $250,000 to plan, design, and engineer the preservation and reconstruction of the historic Hibbing High School Auditorium.

Project Contact Person

Scott Wirtanen
Business Manager
218-208-0849
scotwirt@hibbing.k12.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Hibbing High School Auditorium Restoration

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,300	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$250	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,550**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$180	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,345	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$25	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,550**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Hugo, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Stormwater Reuse for the City of Hugo	1	GO	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
Hugo short line freight railway trackage repair	2	GO	$ 1,100	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,100	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,100	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Stormwater Reuse for the City of Hugo

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$1 million in state funds is requested to design and construct three stormwater reuse projects in the City of Hugo. Each system will use water from a nearby retention pond to irrigate residential or public areas (see attached figures). Estimated total project costs are $2 million.

Project Description

1. Water's Edge Community Irrigation: Water's Edge is a townhome community that consists of 378 units. This project will reconnect the community's existing irrigation system to stormwater, resulting in a decrease in potable water demand by approximately 15 million gallons annually. Pre-design – including water quality testing, water balance development, and pond surveying – has been conducted.

2. County Road 8 (CSAH 8) Median and Boulevard Irrigation: The City currently has an irrigation system that runs along CSAH 8. This project will reconnect one mile of potable water irrigation with stormwater from a City-owned pond. It is estimated that the project will use 4 million gallons of stormwater annually. Pre-design – including water quality testing, water balance development, and pond surveying – has been conducted.

3. Lion's Park Stormwater Pond Construction and Park Irrigation: Lion's Park, which is directly next to Hugo's City Hall, will undergo reconstruction and renovation during the fall of 2016. As part of this project, the City will construct a stormwater pond northwest of the park that can be used to irrigate the park. The requested funds will go towards pond dredging and irrigation system construction. Because the proposed project will create a new water body, water quality testing cannot be completed at this time; however, other pre-design has been completed.

Project Rationale

Groundwater levels in the northeast metro have declined over the past several decades. To ensure

clean and easily accessible water is readily available to the City for the coming generations, the City has dedicated itself to reduce, reuse, and replenish its water supply. This is consistent with the following state and regional goals:

1. Reducing the use of groundwater resources and moving towards the use of surface water, a goal shared by both the Metropolitan Council and the Department of Natural Resources.

2. Reducing runoff volume and pollutant loading within the Hardwood Creek and Clearwater Creek Watersheds, a requirement of the Rice Creek Watershed District.

The City developed a "Stormwater Capital Improvement Program" in 2011 that includes 19 specific projects. The bond funding will be used to construct four of the projects outlined within the CIP, which would include the conversion of irrigation systems from a groundwater source to a stormwater source. Once implemented, the following will be achieved:

- Irrigation demand reduction of 25 million gallons per year, or approximately 7 percent of the City's annual groundwater pumped.

- Infiltration of up to 25 million gallons of stormwater on an annual basis, resulting in 200 pounds of phosphorus reduction annually.

Other Considerations

The City has successfully implemented a stormwater irrigation system at the Oneka Ridge Golf Course, in collaboration with the Rice Creek Watershed District. In addition, an irrigation system at Beaver Ponds Park will be reconnected using stormwater, with construction beginning in the spring of 2016. The Beaver Ponds Park project received $50,000 in funding from the Metropolitan Council to be used towards construction.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A – City maintained

Who will own the facility?

The City will own each of the irrigation systems.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Hugo

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Water's Edge community will have a joint agreement the City for the maintenance and replacement of the irrigation system.

Public Purpose

The projects will reduce peak summer demand, allowing the City to design its potable water system to a lower usage rate. Not only will the projects ensure adequate water supply, but they will also reduce the need for more wells, more water towers, and larger watermains

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Bryan Bear
City Administrator
651-762-6320
bbear@ci.hugo.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Stormwater Reuse for the City of Hugo

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$12	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$988	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$12**	**$1,988**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$12	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$200	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$200	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,600	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$223	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$12**	**$2,223**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Hugo short line freight railway trackage repair

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,100
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	Our request for a grant of $1.1 million will enable Minnesota Commercial Railway to make the remaining permanent repairs required to restore the tracks to a safe condition for many years to come, providing continued direct rail access to key Hugo employers who depend on it daily for receiving raw materials and shipping finished goods, thereby preserving the jobs of the hundreds of Hugo area residents employed by them.

Project Description

The proposed $1.l million funding in the form of a grant will enable the completion of the second phase of the repairs to the Hugo short line rail trackage.

Phase One, completed in September 2015, and funded by the initial grant appropriated by the 2015 legislature, has included the replacement of nearly 1,000 badly deteriorated railroad ties and the installation of multiple carloads of ballast required to anchor the rails. This phase addressed only the most critically deteriorated areas along the line's 6.5 mile length.

Phase Two, involving the permanent repairs remaining to be made, for which we are requesting an additional $1.1 million grant, will bring the entire line up to the standards required to assure safe and reliable rail access to Bald Eagle Industrial Park and the rail access-dependent businesses located in the park for many years to come. This phase will involve the replacement of an additional 6,600 ties and the installation of 75 carloads of new ballast.

Project Rationale

The Hugo short line freight rail line—a 6.5 mile track extending from White Bear Lake to Hugo—is a critical component of the local economy, serving several key businesses located in the City's Bald Eagle Industrial Park. Because of the track's age and advanced state of deterioration and unsafe condition, it has been threatened with abandonment for more than a year. If abandonment were to occur, the viability of four major employers—J.L. Schwieters Company, Schwieters Companies, Inc., National Recycling, Inc., and Loadmaster Lubricants—would be seriously threatened, as well as the jobs of the nearly 500 people they employ.

The full cost of repairing the trackage to a safe and reliable condition is estimated at $1.l million. The City of Hugo has no ownership interest in the tracks, and due to restrictions in Minnesota

Commercial Railway's lease agreement with BNSF governing its operation on the line which prohibit using the tracks as collateral for a loan, the company is unable to finance the required repairs in the private financial marketplace. Recognizing the emergency, the 2015 Legislature appropriated a grant in the amount of $143,000 to make the temporary repairs identified as urgently needed to keep the tracks in usable condition and postpone abandonment for one year.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

Burlington Northern Sante Fe Railroad will continue to own the trackage, which is leased to the operator.

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Commercial Railway

Who will use or occupy this space?

Private short line railway

Public Purpose

Movement of Freight, economic development, preservation of jobs

Description of Previous Appropriations

$145,000 was appropriated in the 2015 transportation bill for emergency temporary repairs (Phase 1)

Project Contact Person

Bryan Bear
City Administrator
651-762-6320
bbear@ci.hugo.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Hugo short line freight railway trackage repair

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,100	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,100**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,100	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$72	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,172**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Airline Terminal Construction Project	1	GO	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0

International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission

Project Narrative

($ in thousands)

Airline Terminal Construction Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission is requesting $3,000,000 in state bond funds to complete Phase II of their Airline Terminal Construction Project.

Project Description

The City of International Falls and Koochiching County have partnered to operate the airport at International Falls for over 50 years through a joint powers agreement.The International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission is currently undertaking a two-phased approach to constructing a new terminal facility.

Phase one activities include the demolition of a portion of the existing terminal building, site, preparation including electrical room/building, utilities and site civil work, design, construct, furnish, and equip Phase I of new terminal building to include: public bathrooms, vestibules, public waiting lounge, car rental ticket counter/offices, taxi/tour bus ticket counter/offices, baggage claim, ticket hall, baggage handling, airline ticket office, airline ticket counter, baggage screening, jet bridge and associated access ramp and circulation corridor, secure passenger gate lounge, secure bathrooms and storage area, passenger screening area, search area, janitor closet, and vending area and associated appurtenances of capital nature at the Falls International Airport.

The total cost for Phase I is $8,800,000. The International Falls - Koochiching County Airport Commission did receive $2,200,000 in state bond funds during the 2014 legislative session for Phase I that was matched by $6,600,000 in state, local and federal dollars.

Phase two activities include the demolition of the existing terminal building, site preparation including utilities and site civil work, design, construct, furnish, and equip Phase II of new terminal building to include: TSA office, weather office, conference room, circulation corridor, airport administration offices, customs and border patrol storage, offices, restrooms, passenger processing area, wet hold room, interview room, search room, pre and post customs passenger waiting areas, and vestibule and associated appurtenances of a capital nature at the Falls International Airport.

Total estimated cost for Phase II is $4,500,000. The International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission is requesting $3,000,000 in 2016 state bond funds to complete this project, which will be matched by $1,500,000 in federal dollars. Upon completion of both phases of this project, if the commission is successful with this bonding request, $5,200,000 in state bonding dollars will have been matched by $8,100,000 in state, local and federal dollars.

Project Rationale

The Falls International Airport is one of the few airports in the state that is an International Port of

Entry. The airport is also one of the nine key airports in the MN State Aviation System. This new terminal project is needed to accommodate increasing domestic and international passenger travel, increased business traffic and U.S. Customs activities. The successful completion of this project, the airport will have a multitude of positive benefits including necessary space for public and private traffic, the ability to keep the customs office at the airport and an influx of federal project dollars to the local economy.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

International Falls - Koochiching County

Who will operate the facility?

International Falls - Koochiching County Airport Commission

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

To provide air service to the general public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

See project narrative.

Project Contact Person

Robert (Bob) Anderson
Airport Commission Chairman
218-240-4233
boba@ci.international-falls.mn.us

International Falls-Koochiching County Airport Commission Project Detail

($ in thousands)

Airline Terminal Construction Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$2,200	$3,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$6,600	$1,500	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$8,800**	**$4,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$630	$400	$0	$0
Project Management	$630	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$7,540	$3,605	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$495	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$8,800**	**$4,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Unsure
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Inver Grove Heights, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
SWING BRIDGE PARK	1	GO	$ 6,500	$ 0	$ 0
BRODERICK BOULEVARD RECONSTRUCTION	2	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
ARGENTA TRAIL REALIGNMENT	3	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 10,500	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 10,500	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

SWING BRIDGE PARK

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$6,500,000 in state funds is requested to acquire property for and to predesign, design, construct, and improve Swing Bridge Park, including the Rock Island Swing Bridge and the Swing Bridge Trailhead of the Mississippi River Regional Trail.

Project Description

The scope of this project includes the stretch of land between the South St. Paul Rod and Gun Club on the north end of the park, to the 66th Street Gateway on the south end of the park, with ample parking including ADA compliant parking and access to the park throughout.

The space has been designed to preserve native prairie and savanna grasses, with the use of vegetative buffers, a rain garden and an infiltration basin, historical and interpretive information displays, picnic areas, community event space and ornamental gardens. Various seating areas throughout the park located along asphalt trails will ensure a place to rest and relax as you meander through, enjoying the natural beauty and step back in time to visit the historic buildings or wander out to the end of the Rock Island Swing Bridge.

The total cost of this project includes $900,000 to acquire an additional four properties, $2,600,000 for public infrastructure improvements on 65th Street and Doffing Avenue, $1,000,000 for improvements to parking lots, and $2,000,000 to improve the railroad crossings in the area of the park. Resources and contributions provided for development of the park and trails by the City of Inver Grove Heights, Dakota County, and nonprofit organizations before the enactment of this section are considered to be sufficient local match, and no further non-state contribution is required. The Mississippi River Regional Trail is funded by Federal Transportation Bills and managed by Dakota County Parks.

Project Rationale

The Rock Island Swing Bridge Park area has a long history of legislative activity. From property remediation contaminated by past railroad actions to property acquisition for the purpose of flood control, the City of Inver Grove Heights has partnered with a number of agencies – the State of Minnesota, National Park Service, Friends of the Mississippi, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, and Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - to create a public gathering space for all to enjoy. These doings have provided a benefit to the state by protecting against loss of property, injury or loss of life, and cities/towns downstream. The goal is to preserve the natural beauty and ecosystem while making it accessible to everyone.

The Rock Island Swing Bridge Trailhead is highlighted on the 19 mile scenic Mississippi River Regional Trail with spectacular views of the Mississippi River from South St. Paul to Hastings. The Mississippi River Regional Trail is funded by Federal Transportation Bills and managed by Dakota

County Parks.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Inver Grove Heights

Who will operate the facility?

City of Inver Grove Heights and Dakota County

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Entity

Public Purpose

To provide access to the Mississippi River, a trailhead for pedestrians and bicyclists, and serve as a natural amenity for passive space enthusiasts.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Eric Carlson
Parks and Recreation Director
651-450-2587
ecarlson@invergroveheights.org

($ in thousands)

SWING BRIDGE PARK

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$900	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,600	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$571	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,071**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

BRODERICK BOULEVARD RECONSTRUCTION

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$2,000,000 in state funds is requested for a grant to the City of Inver Grove Heights for preliminary design, final design, inspection services, and reconstruction of Broderick Boulevard between 80th Street and Concord Boulevard abutting Trunk Highway 52 and Inver Grove Community College in Inver Grove Heights. The project includes replacement or renovation of public infrastructure, including City streets & trails, water lines, sanitary sewers, storm water sewers and other public utilities.

Project Description

This project will include street improvements on Broderick Boulevard from Concord Boulevard, north to 80th Street. Full street reconstruction is proposed from College Trail to Concord Boulevard. A full depth mill and overlay will be done between 80th Street East and College Trail. The addition of center median and painted turn lanes will improve the safety related to traffic movements in the commercial–high density residential area. Trails and sidewalks will be improved to provide multi-modal transportation opportunities. This local collector provides access to Inver Hills Community College. Local infrastructure such as storm water management facilities, sanitary sewers and water mains will be affected by the street improvements

Total project costs for Broderick Boulevard Reconstruction, City Project 2015-09D, are estimated at $5.9 million. Current reconstruction costs will be funded through a combination of Municipal State Aid (MSA) Funds, City Pavement Management Program (PMP) Funds, City Utility Funds and Assessments to benefited properties.

Project Rationale

This project will reconstruct an existing city collector street, Broderick Boulevard, which carries an average daily traffic count of 7,000 vehicles per day. It serves as a frontage road for TH 52/55. It is in very poor condition and is the segment of street for which the City receives the most complaints.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Inver Grove Heights

Who will operate the facility?

City of Inver Grove Heights

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Preservation of existing infrastructure.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Scott Thureen
Director of Public Works
651-450-2571
sthureen@invergroveheights.org

($ in thousands)

BRODERICK BOULEVARD RECONSTRUCTION

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$1,300	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$2,645	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$5,945**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$279	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$372	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$46	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,248	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,232	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,177**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	

($ in thousands)

ARGENTA TRAIL REALIGNMENT

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	$2,000,000 in state funds is requested for a grant to the City of Inver Grove Heights for predesign, final design, acquisition of right-of-way and temporary and permanent easements, private utility relocation, inspection services, and construction of the realignment of Argenta Trail in Inver Grove Heights (County State-Aid Highway 28/63, north and east of where it becomes Yankee Doodle Road in Eagan) in anticipation of the development of an interchange of Argenta Trail and Trunk Highway 55 in the future.

Project Description

The scope of the Argenta Trail realignment project includes extending the four-lane divided section of County State Aid Highway 28/63 (south of Trunk Highway 55) through the Trunk Highway 55 intersection to Amana Trail, which will then become part of County State Aid Highway 28. These improvements also include turn lanes and a permanent signal system at the intersection with TH 55, full access for the Amana Trail/Argenta Trail intersection, and realignment of the 77th Street connection to County State Aid Highway 28.

The project incorporates the realignment and reconstruction of approximately 3,765 feet of Argenta Trail, realignment and reconstruction of approximately 1,490 feet of 77th Street West, and reconstruction of 730 feet of Amana Trail, as well as pedestrian trails and sidewalks, storm water management features, street lights, restoration and appurtenances.

Dakota County will be the lead agency for right-of-way acquisition and construction. The right-of-way process has already begun, as of June 2015. The Dakota County Board of Commissioners will be presented with right-of-way acquisition offers (total acquisition properties, permanent and/or temporary easements) on December 15, 2015. If approved by the County Board, the offers will be presented to the individual property owners.

The total cost of this project is estimated at $14,181,000, which will be shared by Mn/DOT, Dakota County and the City of Inver Grove Heights. The City's share is proposed to be funded via street reconstruction bonds.

Project Rationale

The purpose of this project is to improve safety by bringing County State Aid Highway 28/63 up to current design standards while providing the capacity for anticipated future growth in alignment with the city's comprehensive plan for development. The City of Inver Grove Heights and Dakota County are partnering on the design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the realignment through the intersection of Trunk Highway 55 in Inver Grove Heights. The final design will improve traffic safety and mobility, and improve access to both commercial and residential development.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Dakota County, City of Inver Grove Heights, and Mn/DOT will own various portions.

Who will operate the facility?

Dakota County, City of Inver Grove Heights, and Mn/DOT will operate various portions.

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

Transportation

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Scott Thureen
Director of Public Works
651-450-2571
sthureen@invergroveheights.org

($ in thousands)

ARGENTA TRAIL REALIGNMENT

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$425	$0	$0	$0
City Funds	$2,895	$0	$621	$0
County Funds	$8,240	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$11,560**	**$2,000**	**$621**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$127	$4,860	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$894	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$8,300	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,708	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,021**	**$14,868**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Popple River Recreation Bridge and Village Road Connection	1	GO	$ 385	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 385	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 385	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Popple River Recreation Bridge and Village Road Connection

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$385
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$385,000 in state bonding dollars is requested to design, bid and construct a multi-use recreation bridge over Popple River and extend paved trail to Village Road in the city of Squaw Lake with Itasca County serving as local government sponsor with City and recreation clubs partnering on maintenance.(Phase II)

Project Description

The multi-use recreational Popple River Bridge and paved trail connection to Village Road (Phase II) has been desired for many years for resident and visitor pedestrians who walk along state highway #46.

It is also part of a 150 mile ATV/OHM trail system that extends from Island Lake to Sure Game Resort to Winnie Lake Dam to Decker Lake Area. Squaw Lake is a critical connector trail for the entire trail system. There are numerous partners involved and in support of this project. They include the City of Squaw Lake, Leech Lake Tribal Council, Itasca County, the Alvwood-Squaw Lake ATV Club, and local businesses.

The City of Squaw Lake is known for their well-maintained ditches along highway 46. While the Squaw Lake Multi-use Corridor Trail was being planned in this area it was directly noted that the City would like their ditches protected as well as allowing other uses on the trail to access multiple businesses. Currently, residents walk the shoulder of the heavy traveled highway to get to other homes and local businesses. This presents a significant safety risk with vehicles going 40-50 mph.

It is important for this project to be funded so residents and visitors do not have to walk on the busy state highway and county road alongside 50mph vehicle traffic. Additionally, there is no other way to connect the 150 mile ATV Trail system so users can access food, groceries, gas and restrooms in Squaw Lake.

Project Rationale

There is a bottleneck of traffic on the State Highway #46 Popple River Bridge that includes pedestrians, bicyclists, ATV, snowmobile and 40+ mph vehicle traffic. There is no other connection opportunity for recreational trails in Squaw Lake. Public safety is of high concern for the citizens of Squaw Lake. Leech Lake Tribal Council requests safe passage for Village residents to get to general store, other businesses and neighbors.

Other Considerations

The overall Squaw Lake Multi-Use Corridor Trail (Phase I and Phase II) was proposed and planned to solve the present safety risk for the community's residents, enable protection of the ditches from ATV use, and providing tourism and economic development for the local businesses. The proposed multi-use paved and non-paved corridor trail will be 10 feet wide. A dual-use trail segment goes from Round Lake public access road to The Hill Restaurant in the west TH#46 ROW. The remainder of the (Phase I) 1.26 mile paved trail is pedestrians/bikes only with a separated non-paved ATV trail in the corridor and connects to the East Squaw Lake Road Community center.

The attached letter of support from Leech Lake and their committment of $150,000 is for the (Phase I) 1.26 mile paved trail that connects to this project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

State grant-in-aid money will be used for maintenance along with the City, Leech Lake and recreational clubs funds and volunteer labor.

Who will own the facility?

Itasca County.

Who will operate the facility?

Itasca County as local government sponsor in cooperation with the City of Squaw Lake, Leech Lake Tribal Council and recreation clubs.

Who will use or occupy this space?

No private entity occupancy/use. Recreation clubs would be involved with maintaining the facility otherwise it is all public use.

Public Purpose

multi-use recreation and improved public safety.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No state bonding dollars but $150,000 from Leech Lake Tribal Council; $150,000 of county held federal dollars: $80,000 of state held FRTP (federal) dollars. (all for Phase I)

Project Contact Person

Garrett Ous
Land Commissioner
218-327-2855
garrett.ous@co.itasca.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Popple River Recreation Bridge and Village Road Connection

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$385	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$125	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$135	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$125	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$770**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$110	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$605	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$55	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$770**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Koochiching County

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Island View Sewer Project	1	GO	$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Island View Sewer Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Koochiching County is requesting funds to provide centralized sewer to local residents and businesses as well as those who visit the Rainy Lake area and Voyageurs National park East of International Falls. The project extends to the end of State Hwy 11, approximately 5 miles past the location where the current sewer line ends.

Project Description

The Island View Sewer Project is the 3rd step in extending a sewer line along the shores of Rainy Lake in Koochiching County. The first step was done around 1975 and included areas just east of Ranier. The 2nd step was the Jackfish Bay Sewer Project which was completed in 2007. Other than $400,000 the Jackfish Bay project was funded by a $4M grant and $4M loan through PFA. Koochiching County spent approximately $300,000 on designing that project and is paying back the loan through local assessment.

The Island View Sewer Project is the final step needed to finish extending a sewer line on the mainland. The cost of the project is estimated to be between $16.8M and $18.8M. There are approximately 180 homes and 7 businesses within the project area, however these numbers are deceiving. There is also a large number of vacant parcels, some as large as 40 acres that have not been developed due to the high cost and difficulty of sewage treatment. Centralized sewer would allow new businesses to open, current businesses to expand and many more cabins and homes to be built. The increased tax base would be an economic boost to Koochiching County.

The project consists of approximately 23 miles of pipe, most of which will be horizontally drilled at a depth of about 8 feet. There will be very little surface disruption or tree removal so the environmental and aesthetic impacts are nearly non-existent. Pre-design and design were done in late 2010 at a cost of $400,000 to Koochiching County. That same year the County received $100,000 of a $285,000 bonding bill allocation to the Voyageurs National Park Clean Water Joint Powers Board (VNPCWJPB). Since then the County has paid for legal assistance, financial consulting and additional engineering costs. In 2014 the County was allocated another $7.8M for the IVSP from a bonding bill package to the VNPCWJPB. However, in the 4 years that passed between finishing the design and being approved for funding, the cost of the project has risen dramatically.

Construction easements will be obtained the same way they were for the Jackfish Bay Sewer Project. That project had enough support that nearly all property owners within the project area agreed to sell easements to the county for $1. In the end the project will benefit the area economically and also protect water quality on a very valuable resource.

Project Rationale

This is the 3rd and final stage of solving a decades old problem of sewage treatment along the shores of Rainy Lake in Koochiching County. Shallow bedrock, thins soils, wetlands, small lots and rugged terrain make it extremely difficult to meet the state rules for sewage treatment. A feasibility study done

in 1999 showed that between the choice of individual systems, cluster systems, holding tanks and a centralized sewer system, centralized sewer is the best long term option. Besides the many homes, cabins and businesses, VNP hosts approximately 240,000 visitors annually. Wastewater from the Park's nearly 180 campsites is currently pumped into a trailer, transferred across the lake on a barge and hauled to International Falls for disposal. This project would alleviate leaking septic systems and reduce the odds of accidental spillage during transport.

Other Considerations

The City of Int'l Falls and many shoreline property owners use Rainy Lake as a source of potable water.

Koochiching County has expended more than $400,000 for the design of this project. It has been shovel ready since 2010.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

Koochiching County

Who will operate the facility?

East Koochiching Sanitary Sewer District (EKSSD)

Who will use or occupy this space?

Property owners and businesses in the project area will be tied into the sewer system.

Public Purpose

Visitors to the area will be served by the system, including many of the approximately 240,000 people who visit Voyageurs National Park every year.

Description of Previous Appropriations

MN State Bonding Bill 2010	$100,000
MN State Bonding Bill 2014	$7.8M

Project Contact Person

Dale M Olson

Environmental Services Director
218-283-1156
dale.olson@co.koochiching.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Island View Sewer Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$7,912	$6,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$430	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$3,500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$8,342**	**$10,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$30	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$400	$1,000	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$15,550	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,047	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$430**	**$18,597**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Unsure
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Unsure
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Lilydale, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Lilydale Stormwater Project #2 Modifications and Big Rivers Regional Trail Structure Repairs	1	GO	$ 140	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 140	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 140	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Lilydale Stormwater Project #2 Modifications and Big Rivers Regional Trail Structure Repairs

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$140
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The City of Lilydale requests $140,000 in state funds to help fund construction of a new drop shaft to convey storm water from the top of the Mississippi River bluff safely down the bluff. The project will also repair and improve existing drainage structures along the Big Rivers Regional Trail at the base of the bluff.

Project Description

Lilydale is a city with approximately one mile of Mississippi River bluff line and is down stream from surface water flow originating in the cities of Mendota Heights and West St. Paul.

This project includes constructing a new storm sewer system and drop shaft to improve stormwater drainage and quality in the vicinity of the intersection of Lexington Avenue and Trunk Highway 13 in the City of Lilydale. The project will improve the drainage on top of the Mississippi River bluff by increasing stormwater system capacity, safely convey the added water down the bluff through a new drop shaft, and repair and improve existing drainage structures along the Big Rivers Regional Tail at the base of the bluff.

The City of Lilydale is collaborating with MnDOT on this project (State Project Number 1902-74). Lilydale intends to lead, let and provide contract administration and construction oversight. The total cost of the project is $487,862, of which the City's portion is $346,221. The City has incurred $50,000 for engineer and design work that has been paid for using stormwater utility revenue funds. The remaining balance is $296,221. This project is now at the shovel-ready phase.

The City has been approved by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services for a grant from the 2014 State Bond Funded Municipal Inflow and Infiltration Grant Program. The grant amount for this project is $15,000.

The City of Mendota Heights and Dakota County will be contributing approximately $5,395 toward the project based on the portion of the total runoff to the project area.

Project Rationale

Under existing conditions, stormwater runoff has created three significant issues that this project will address.

First, the project will significantly reduce the volume of runoff being discharged at the top of the bluff. Reducing stormwater runoff improves water quality and lessens the potential for damage to both the Big Rivers Trail and its users and the Union Pacific railroad tracks. Reducing runoff also decreases the risks of a significant bluff failure. The Big Rivers Regional Trail and Union Railroad are located at the base of the bluff and both have been damaged in the past from erosion and bluff failures.

Second, it will prevent flooding. There is localized flooding of residential properties during heavy rainfall resulting in property damage. The project will significantly reduce the runoff volume conveyed across private property where past damage has occurred.

Third, it will improve stormwater management thus improving water quality. The existing drainage system conveys runoff through the Big Rivers Regional Trail. Large storm events in recent years damaged the drainage structure. The project will replace the damaged structure and make other improvements to reduce the risk of future damage to the drainage system, thereby lessening the potential for system failure.

Other Considerations

The City of Lilydale and MnDOT are in the final stages of construction to complete cooperative project S.P. 1902-55 which includes a mill and overlay and installation of curb and gutter intended to convey stormwater for Trunk Highway 13. Lilydale is responsible for the cost of trunk storm sewer construction over MnDOT's base design. The original cost estimate for the City was $172,248. The final amount increased 53% to $323,806 which the City has paid for with storm sewer, sanitary sewer and general funds. As a result, the City's storm sewer fund has been depleted and the sanitary sewer fund balance has been reduced by over 50%, leaving both funds at unacceptable and precarious levels.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The City has made significant financial commitments to managing stormwater issues. In 2015 the City's storm sewer fund has been depleted and the sanitary sewer fund balance has been reduced by over 50% to fund a related stormwater project. Both funds are now at unacceptable and precarious levels. The City will seek bonding to cover the costs of this project to sufficiently match funds applied for in this request. The City recently completed a stormwater utility rate study. The current stormwater rates for property owners in Lilydale are significantly higher than in other surrounding municipalities. Nevertheless, stormwater rates are expected to sharply increase in 2016.

Who will own the facility?

City of Lilydale

Who will operate the facility?

City of Lilydale

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

To improve stormwater management thus improving water quality and protecting vital natural resources including the Mississippi River bluff.

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Mary Schultz
City Administrator
651-457-2316
cityoflilydale@comcast.net

($ in thousands)

Lilydale Stormwater Project #2 Modifications and Big Rivers Regional Trail Structure Repairs

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$140	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$15	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$136	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$5	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$296**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$41	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$255	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$296**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	No
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	No
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	No
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Litchfield, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Phase 2 Power Generation Improvements	1	GO	$ 5,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 5,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 5,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Phase 2 Power Generation Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$5,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$5 million in state bond funding to design and construct electrical generation improvements in the City of Litchfield to expand the current standby generation capacity to meet the expanding electrical demands in the City as a result of the continuous expansion of First District Association (FDA).

Project Description

First District Association (FDA) is a dairy processing facility that is undertaking an expansion that will double their processing capacity of their facility, which, in turn, substantially increases their usage of electricity. Overall, the project will create 30 new jobs, create a potential 410 associates jobs in Central Minnesota and leverage over $100M in private investments. The impact of the FDA expansion is not limited to Litchfield or Meeker County, but will extend throughout Minnesota. Currently, FDA producers are located in 36 Minnesota Counties, which will all benefit from the expansion. In addition, FDA products are sold to customers all over the world.

Based on the above information, the City of Litchfield is committed to partnering with FDA to prove them a reliable power source even during times of outages. The City invested $15 million to complete Phase 1 of their generation improvements and is now will to undertake Phase 2 to add the necessary generation capabilities to meet the demands of the expanding industry as well as the rest of the community. Given the state and regional impact of the FDA expansion, a $5 million commitment from the State would help bring the City's generation project to completion and ultimately provide FDA a reliable power source to operate their expanding facility.

Project Rationale

First District Association (FDA) is undergoing an expansion that will more than double the electricity that the facility uses and will likely exceed 8 MW. Therefore, in order to be prepared to provide standby power to FDA, the City is looking to add 4 MW of standby generation to their generation facility that was constructed in 2008 (10 MW facility). In addition, the City has two old generators in their old generation facility that are in need of replacement to ensure that they are able to provide reliable power. FDA relies 100% on the City of Litchfield to provide power to their facility at all times, even during power outages, so it is critical that the City be prepared to meet the demands of this regional facility.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional State operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Litchfield

Who will operate the facility?

City of Litchfield

Who will use or occupy this space?

No private entities will occupy or use the Generation Facility.

Public Purpose

The City of Litchfield's expansion of the Generation Facility will not only provide reliable electricity to FDA but also to the residents and businesses in the region. In addition, expanding the Generation Facility and thus providing the electricity necessary for the First District Association (FDA) will create numerous job opportunities and leverage considerable private investments in and throughout Minnesota.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City received a $250,000 matching grant in 2014 for predesign and design activities. The City provided an additional $250,000 in local matching funds towards the predesign and design activities. The City is anticipating additional appropriations funding in 2016 for construction of the project.

Project Contact Person

Mr. David Cziok
City Administrator
320-693-7201
dave.cziok@ci.litchfield.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Phase 2 Power Generation Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$250	$5,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$250	$5,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$500**	**$10,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$500	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$450	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$650	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$8,900	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$500**	**$10,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Mankato, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Regional Water Quality Improvement Strategy	1	GO	$ 14,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 14,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 14,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Regional Water Quality Improvement Strategy

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$14,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$14 million is requested to implement a comprehensive regional water quality improvement strategy, including projects in and around Mankato, North Mankato, Eagle Lake, Madison Lake, South Bend Township and areas in Blue Earth and Nicollet Counties. Funds will be used for inflow and infiltration investigation/monitoring, acquisition of easements and land, predesign, design, and construction to implement the comprehensive regional water quality improvement strategy, including infrastructure, storm water management and flood protection improvements.

Project Description

The comprehensive regional water quality improvement strategy includes inflow and infiltration investigation and inspections, including televising existing lines, to determine existing conditions of sanitary sewer infrastructure in Mankato, North Mankato, Eagle Lake, Madison Lake and South Bend Township, as well as necessary infrastructure improvements based on the findings of the investigation and inspections. Other initiatives included in the project are storm water management improvements such as regional ponding, outfall erosion reduction and flood protection improvements, such as river bank stabilization, pump station improvements and regional erosion control. Total project cost is $28,100,000. Matching funds will be provided through a variety of sources, including assessments, utility funds, sewer rates and local option sales tax.

Project Rationale

The comprehensive regional water quality improvement strategy will address water quality issues related to the Minnesota River and its tributaries in the Mankato region. The Minnesota River in south central Minnesota has been identified as an Impaired Water by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, making it crucial to implement a strategy to improve water quality. Addressing the issue regionally is the only way to effectively reduce impairments to the Minnesota River. The improvements undertaken as part of this strategy will mitigate pollutant and sediment mobilization into the Minnesota River by preventing channel and bank erosion and flooding, as well as reducing inflow and infiltration into existing regional sanitary sewer system. This will preserve capacity of the system and ensure that all waste water is treated to a level that meets or exceeds current standards, providing continued water quality improvement of all receiving streams of our regional partners.

Other Considerations

The city of Mankato has undertaken numerous proactive steps to address water quality in the past two decades, including inflow and infiltration investigation and abatement of Mankato properties. As an example, 5 years ago the city of Mankato invested over $5 million in an infrastructure improvement to

abate an inflow and infiltration issue. Storm water improvements have also been undertaken to bring old infrastructure up to modern pollution control standards. Water quality issues are especially important in the Mankato region because there are more miles of river in Blue Earth County than any other county in Minnesota and they all flow through Mankato.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

Cities of Mankato, North Mankato, Eagle Lake, and Madison Lake, South Bend Township, Counties of Blue Earth and Nicollet. These entities will form a joint powers board for implementation of the project.

Who will operate the facility?

City of Mankato

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

Public infrastructure and improved quality of public waters.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Pat Hentges
City Manager
507-387-8695
phentges@mankatomn.gov

($ in thousands)

Regional Water Quality Improvement Strategy

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$14,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Funding	$0	$14,100	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$28,100**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$250	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,463	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$1,075	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$19,357	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$4,955	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$28,100**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

McLeod County — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Morningside (CSAH 15) Corridor Completion	1	GO	$ 2,350	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,350	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,350	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Morningside (CSAH 15) Corridor Completion

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,350
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$2.35 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, design (pre-design has been completed), and construct new urban street extension of McLeod County State Aid Highway 15 (CSAH 15), also known as Morningside within the City of Glencoe, and adjacent trail between 11th and 16th Street. Additionally, the project includes providing stormwater and drainage improvements, which would provide flood mitigation for a significant portion of the community.

Project Description

The project costs are $4.7 million. The applicant is seeking $2.35 million in State Bonding funds to complete the project. The local match includes commitments by the City of Glencoe ($1.025 million) and McLeod County ($1.025 million). Furthermore, federal funds in the amount of $300,000 have been committed to the proposed rail crossing. Funding will allow for the reconstruction of an existing segment of Morningside Avenue/CSAH 15 from 11th Street north to the railroad tracks construction of a new rail crossing and new roadway section north to 16th Street. The roadway will be constructed utilizing a 10-ton design standard. The project is to include a roundabout at the intersection at 16th Street and a trail along the west side of the roadway from 11th Street to Oscar Olson Park north of 14th Street. The railroad crossing at Union Avenue will be closed when the new crossing is constructed at Morningside Avenue. Stormwater improvements include constructing new storm sewer lines and a stormwater pond. There are 2 homes located just south of the TC&W railroad tracks that are recommended to be acquired and removed due to grade, railroad crossing, drainage, and access issues.

Project Rationale

Morningside Avenue/CSAH 15 has several characteristics that relate to its regional significance:

1. This route has been planned since the 1960's to connect from US 212 to the north side of the community and the CSAH routes in that area. Right-of-way has been preserved for close to five decades. The 2003 Glencoe Transportation Partnership Study, completed in coordination with the State of Minnesota, McLeod County, the City of Glencoe and Mid-Minnesota Regional Development, affirmed the need for the Morningside Corridor as a route for regional traffic. It noted that this route would serve as an alternative to TH 22 for the City of Hutchinson and other regional traffic. The City of Hutchinson has expressed its support for improving access for traffic to and from the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

2. There are no other routes within the City of Glencoe that connect to US 212 and the City of Glencoe north and south of Buffalo Creek. Furthermore, this is the only controlled intersection on US 212 within the City of Glencoe. Significant previous investments have been made to preserve

and improve this corridor, including a new bridge over Buffalo Creek, the extension of CSAH 15 south of US 212, and the construction of street and infrastructure improvements north within the City's industrial park (11th Avenue) north of US 212. Several businesses have developed and expanded on this route due to the characteristics of the route, including a grocery store, automobile dealership, corporate bank headquarters, hotel, manufacturing businesses, and numerous retail businesses. Other commercial developers have also been looking at this area for development.

3. The route connects to CSAH routes on both sides of US 212 and Buffalo Creek, as well as CSAH routes that provide access to regional traffic from Hutchinson, Silver Lake and other areas of McLeod County. This traffic is currently routed primarily on very circuitous routes through the City, including TH 22, promoting the use of local routes for regional truck traffic, requiring several turns in busy residential and commercial areas, and creating accessibility and safety concerns.

4. The route would include a new and safe crossing at Morningside Avenue of the increasingly busy Twin Cities and Western (TC&W) Railway. The adjacent rail crossing at Union Avenue has steep grades and poor sight lines, providing limited safe access in the area. As part of this project the Union Avenue crossing will be closed. Federal rail crossing funding has been approved for the project.

5. This route would provide direct and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the Glencoe Public School complex located on the north-west end of the project. Traffic currently is required to make several turns in residential areas to access the school, creating accessibility and safety concerns for the community. The current school complex includes the Junior and High School buildings. The school district passed a referendum in May of 2015 to construct a new elementary school adjacent to the Junior and High School buildings. This $25 million construction project will be completed by the Fall of 2016.

6. The project includes stormwater and drainage improvements that would serve thousands of acres of the City and surrounding rural areas. The area has experienced flooding, and significant surface and groundwater damage due to the lack of an appropriate outlet. The project would provide an outlet for the water in the east and north-east area of the City, provide additional ponding to reduce potential damage and increase stormwater quality, and also lower the groundwater levels in areas where damage is occurring to private and public housing. In addition, these improvements would provide an improved outlet for the north-central ponding system that serves approximately 1,200 acres of the City and County to the north and west of this project area. This expansive area has experienced repeated flooding issues, including a significant event with wide-spread property damage in 2013.

Other Considerations

Not completing this project would provide undue hardship on the City and County, continue the current circuitous and unsafe pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns, and allow for continued stormwater flooding and groundwater damage in the area. It would also be detrimental to the commercial and industrial growth of the City to not proceed with the full project as proposed. The improved safety features of the project, including the roundabout, improved rail crossing, and designated pedestrian routes, will enhance the safety of all transportation in the area, but is especially important given the close proximity of the school.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

McLeod County

Who will operate the facility?

McLeod County and City of Glencoe

Who will use or occupy this space?

This will be a public facility

Public Purpose

The project will improve a regional transportation route benefiting local and regional residents and businesses.

Description of Previous Appropriations

NA

Project Contact Person

John Brunkhorst
County Engineer
320-484-4321
john.brunkhorst@co.mcleod.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Morningside (CSAH 15) Corridor Completion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,350	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$300	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$1,025	$0	$0
County Funds	$0	$1,025	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,700**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$600	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$460	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$3,640	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,700**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Unsure
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Unsure
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Hall's Island Restoration	1	GO	$ 12,000	$ 0	$ 0
26th Avenue River Access: Restoring Connections	2	GO	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
Minneapolis Trail System Gaps	3	GO	$ 7,500	$ 0	$ 0
Upper Harbor Terminal Site Remediation	4	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 24,500	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 24,500	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Hall's Island Restoration

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$12,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $12,000,000 in state bond funding to predesign, design and construct a re-created river island and park facility in the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, for the purpose of providing public access to new riverfront park facilities and restored ecological habitat areas.

Project Description

The project proposes to restore Hall's Island, one of dozens of natural islands that for hundreds of years thrived in upper the Mississippi River, but have been lost to channelization and industrial land uses. Project goals include creating a major new regional park destination in the heart of Minneapolis, extending riverbank and aquatic habitat zones along the riverfront, contributing to clean-water goals, and resisting aquatic invasive species (AIS). Today, this stretch of riverbank is armored with a hardened edge, a remnant of former industrial uses. The project would create a new island with several habitat zones for migrating and nesting species. The island would shelter a new east channel and a gravel river beach on the east bank, providing river access to park visitors and paddlers.

In 1966, Scherer Bros. Lumber Company excavated Hall's Island to extend their riverbank lumberyard site. In 2013, the Minnesota State Legislature passed omnibus bill 976, authorizing the restoration of the island and the east channel that it shelters. The bill states that, "once recreated and restored, Hall's Island shall remain in public ownership in perpetuity and shall be maintained as a natural habitat island for birds and other wildlife. Public access and recreational activities shall be limited to a walking trail to protect the island's wildlife and habitat."

Hall's Island will constitute a portion of a new park on the former Scherer Bros. site. The total area of the proposed Hall's Island project, including the associated east channel and gravel beach, is 347,041 square feet, or nearly 8 acres. The total area of the proposed new park, including both the landside area and Hall's Island, is 566,854 square feet, or 13 acres.

The total project cost to acquire and reconstruct Hall's Island for public use is $24,930,000. Primary funding sources include the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, the State of Minnesota Clean Water Land and Legacy Fund, Metropolitan Council Regional Park Acquisition Opportunity Funds and Regional Park funds, the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization, the Hennepin County Brownfield Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund, and State Parks and Trails Legacy Funds.

Project Rationale

The Upper Mississippi River has historically been an industrial landscape. This has prevented access to high-quality recreational and natural amenities for North and Northeast Minneapolis: communities historically underserved by such amenities. The reconstruction of Hall's Island is the first major step in implementation of RiverFirst, a community-driven vision for transforming the upper river into an

extensive open space amenity for the region. Halls' Island will allow underserved communities direct access to the river and will become a key node in a trail system that will promote health, wellness, and outdoor recreation.

Hall's Island will also restore lost habitat in the Upper Mississippi River. Channelization and dredging of the river for navigation has had a profound detrimental impact on species diversity in the riverway. Islands used to be more common in the river, and provided a variety of habitats for fish, reptiles, amphibians, small mammals, and migratory and resident birds. This project will provide a range of habitats across varying water depths and terrestrial landscape types, some specifically designed to attract and support state and federally listed species, such as turtles, mussels, and invertebrates.

In addition, this project will promote creation of 240 jobs in construction and parks operations. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) estimates that approximately 20 new jobs are created for every $1,000,000 invested in parks and recreation. Furthermore, a new park on the project site will spur economic development in the surrounding community, a goal that is supported by City of Minneapolis policy as well as nearby community organizations.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Impact on MPRB operating costs has been studied in detail as part of the RiverFirst project. MPRB is currently exploring arrangements to allow land lease income from a development parcel to be applied directly to O&M related to Hall's Island and the landside portion of the park.

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

Parks and recreation, habitat restoration

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson

Interim Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparks.org

($ in thousands)

Hall's Island Restoration

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$12,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$8,689	$1,500	$0	$0
County Funds	$1,000	$0	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$781	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$960	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$10,470**	**$14,460**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$7,700	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$270	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$810	$361	$0	$0
Project Management	$150	$100	$0	$0
Construction	$1,540	$12,338	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,661	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$10,470**	**$14,460**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

26th Avenue River Access: Restoring Connections

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	This request is for $3,000,000 in state bond funding to design and construct a new Mississippi River overlook and access point at the terminus of 26th Ave. N., located in the City of Minneapolis in Hennepin County, along with a trail connection between that access point and the Grand Rounds Trail System at Ole Olson Park.

Project Description

This request would leverage the city's 26th Avenue North project by creating a river overlook and access point at the Mississippi River, along with a trail connection south to the Grand Rounds at Ole Olson Park. Trail users will be able to continue south into the already complete portion of the city-wide trail system that begins at Ole Olson Park. The total project cost of the 26th Avenue River Access and trail connection is $3,000,000, which includes design and construction of pedestrian and bicycle routes from the end of 26th Avenue to Ole Olson Park, an interpretive river overlook / fishing area, and a direct water access. Though the trail gap in this location is only about 1/4 mile, making this connection would provide North Minneapolis with comprehensive access to the 50+ mile trail system.

The proposed improvements along 26th Ave. N. are strongly supported by local residents and partner agencies. This state bond funding would augment other funding sources and partner-agency projects.

Project Rationale

This project would complete a connection between north Minneapolis neighborhoods and the Mississippi River, capitalizing on work to be completed soon by the City of Minneapolis along the length of 26th Avenue N. between Theodore Wirth Regional Park and the Mississippi River. For decades, safe, continuous connections between residential areas of north Minneapolis and the Mississippi River have been limited by I-94, which slices through the city and creates a formidable barrier. Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements on 26th Ave. N. will contribute to ongoing community revitalization, and would link to a larger network of existing and planned bicycle facilities on both sides of the river: Lyndale Ave. N. Bikeway, 2nd St. N. Bikeway, future West River Parkway trails, Lowry Ave. Bikeway, Marshall Street Bikeway, 18th Ave NE Bikeway, etc.

The City's 26th Avenue N. project stops just short of the river, so this project is critical in extending that important work eastward to the Mississippi.

This project will promote creation of 60 jobs in construction and parks operations. The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) estimate that approximately 20 new jobs are created for every $1,000,000 invested in parks and recreation. Parks also help to stabilize land values and encourage neighborhood reinvestment.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Operating budget will increase for MPRB portion of project (trails, overlook, river access). MPRB is exploring partnerships with other agencies and organizations to offset operational costs. The project sits within a Regional Park boundary and is therefore eligible for Metropolitan Council O&M funding.

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

Trails, river access

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparks.org

($ in thousands)

26th Avenue River Access: Restoring Connections

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$62	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$558	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$180	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,200	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Minneapolis Trail System Gaps

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$7,500
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	This request is for $7.5 million in state bond funding to predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip trail projects located in the City of Minneapolis and Hennepin County to enhance the public bicycle and pedestrian network throughout the city.

Project Description

These improvements (listed below) range from trail connections across geographic barriers to small connections that maximize existing infrastructure.

- **Plymouth Avenue Bridge Bicycle and Walkway Connection:** This project recaptures space on the existing Plymouth Avenue bridge to add bike lanes, pedestrian amenities and stormwater infrastructure. The estimated cost of this segment is $5,000,000. It would create a link across the river between north and northeast Minneapolis and thereby would expand the trail network accessible to both communities.
- **East Bank Trail on Nicollet Island from Boom Island to Main Street:** This is a ½ -mile corridor with substandard or missing trail segments that would interconnect with existing MPRB regional trails. The estimated cost of this segment is $1,000,000. It would close a critical gap along the Mississippi River between the east bank trail to be constructed north from Boom Island Park in 2016 and existing trails and bridges within the downtown riverfront.
- **Pedestrian/Ski Bridge Over Theodore Wirth Parkway in South Wirth Park:** This bridge proposed near the Quaking Bog parking lot will provide a grade-separated crossing for pedestrians and skiers. The estimated cost of this segment is $1,500,000. It will enhance year-round safety within Wirth Park by separating vehicles and non-motorized traffic.

Project Rationale

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board owns and maintains more than 55 miles of dedicated bicycle and walking trails in Minneapolis and neighborhood cities. These trails serve as the backbone to a successful recreation and transportation network that extends into the greater metro area. Throughout the system there are three locations that, if enhanced or built, would provide safer and more accessible routes. This project would have benefits far beyond the three actual construction projects, as it will open dozens of miles of trail to users that currently encounter dead ends at these gaps.

All three projects are located in north and northeast Minneapolis, a region historically underserved by high quality recreational amenities and not currently well linked into the larger regional trail system. Closing these system gaps will allow for expansion of the trail network into north and northeast Minneapolis and will provide linkages from those neighborhoods to the downtown riverfront, the Mississippi River gorge, Minnehaha Park, the Chain of Lakes, and other regional recreational

amenities.

In addition, this project will create 150 jobs in the construction and landscaping industry (research conducted by the National Recreation and Park Association estimates that 20 new jobs are created for every $1,000,000 invested in parks and recreation).

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Operating costs will increase due to construction of new trail segments. However, the total addition of less than one mile of trail to a system of greater than 50 miles will require minimal increase in staffing, equipment, and materials.

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

Transportation (non-motorized) and recreation

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Interim Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparks.org

($ in thousands)

Minneapolis Trail System Gaps

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$7,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$115	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$906	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$450	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,625	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$404	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Upper Harbor Terminal Site Remediation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	4
Project Summary:	This request is for $2,000,000 for site remediation of future parkland within what is currently the Minneapolis Upper Harbor Terminal – a public barge terminal on the Mississippi River in north Minneapolis.

Project Description

The City of Minneapolis and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board are working together to plan the future of the UHT. Though final development plans have not yet been finalized, it is expected that the parkland portion of the project will include an extension of West River Parkway, bicycle and pedestrian trails, restored river shoreline, and areas for park activities such as picnicking and impromptu sports. The total acreage of the park portion of the site is still being determined, but the UHT includes 4,300 linear feet of Mississippi River shoreline.

The total cost of remediation of the park portion of the UHT is $2,000,000. The remainder of the site would be remediated with other funds, likely led by the City of Minneapolis. No final development costs have been prepared as yet. The focus of this state bond request is to prepare the site for any park amenities.

Project Rationale

In 2001, the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board and City of Minneapolis adopted the Above the Falls Master Plan, a visionary land use and park plan for the Upper Mississippi River district of Minneapolis. Among other things, the plan calls for closure of the Upper Harbor Terminal and converting the land to a combination of urban redevelopment and parkland. The terminal has been in operation since 1968.

The City of Minneapolis is now poised to close the terminal. The City and Park Board are arranging to transfer a portion of the property to the Park Board and the Park Board is prepared to begin park development and shoreline restoration. The future of the property will include extension of West River Parkway, a regional trail route and a significant regional riverfront park destination in north Minneapolis.

As can be imagined after 45 years as a barge terminal and prior industrial uses, the property has significant remediation needs ranging from removal of fill and contaminated materials to conversion of the shoreline from steel sheeting to a more natural state. The bonding request will assist in these endeavors on the future parkland portion of the property.

Remediation is the first step in opening a formerly industrial section of the upper Mississippi River shoreline to public use. Located in North Minneapolis, this project, at full build-out, will offer direct access to high-quality water-based amenities for an area of the state historically underserved by such

amenities. Parkland on the UHT is a critical step in connecting north Minneapolis into the Grand Rounds and the regional park system.

In addition, this remediation alone will create 40 jobs in the construction and landscaping industry (research conducted by the National Recreation and Park Association estimates that 20 new jobs are created for every $1,000,000 invested in parks and recreation).

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

none: remediation is a one-time expense

Who will own the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

Public land clean-up for future park and recreation uses

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Adam Arvidson
Interim Director of Strategic Planning
612-230-6470
aarvidson@minneapolisparks.org

($ in thousands)

Upper Harbor Terminal Site Remediation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$240	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$120	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,640	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
10th Avenue SE Bridge over the Mississippi River Concrete Arch Rehabilitation	1	GO	$ 31,875	$ 0	$ 0
Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement	2	GO	$ 2,500	$ 0	$ 0
Pioneers and Soldiers Cemetery Fence Restoration Project	3	GO	$ 609	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 34,984	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 34,984	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

10th Avenue SE Bridge over the Mississippi River Concrete Arch Rehabilitation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$31,875
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$31.875 million in state funds is requested to design and construct a major rehabilitation of the 10th Avenue SE Bridge over the Mississippi River between West River Parkway and 2nd Street SE located in the City of Minneapolis.

Project Description

The 10th Avenue SE Bridge is a 2,153-foot long concrete open spandrel arch structure that rises 109 feet above the Mississippi River. The 68.1-foot wide bridge deck contains a 55.5-foot roadway (four-lanes) and a barrier-protected eight-foot wide pedestrian facility. Additionally, the structure has steam, electrical, and communication utilities tied to the substructure.

The project scope includes replacement of the entire bridge deck. Below the bridge deck, select concrete floor beams and spandrel columns would be completely removed and replaced. Other floor beams and spandrel columns would have deteriorated concrete removed and repaired. Significant concrete repairs would be made to the arches and large piers. Work will also include surface coating and the installation of anodes to slow corrosion of the concrete reinforcing steel.

The total project cost is estimated to be $42.5 million. This is significantly less than the cost replacing the crossing with a new bridge.

Predesign has been completed and no additional land is needed for the project. The intent is to move the project forward as a design/construction request. Matching funding will be provided by the City of Minneapolis.

Project Rationale

The proposed project will address the ongoing deterioration of concrete on the spandrel columns, floor beams, arches, and bridge deck. It will also restore the historic structure and add a minimum of 40 years to its useful life. The proposed improvements will immediately stem the deterioration of the bridge's concrete structure, preserving the bridge for future use by multi-modal transportation system users.

A recent economic analysis found the Benefit to Cost (B/C) Ratio of this project was 2.94. The B/C Ratio of replacing the bridge was 1.44. (A B/C ratio of less than 1.0 would indicate the project is not a financially viable alternative.)

Without rehabilitation, the bridge would eventually have to be replaced or demolished. The cost of a bridge replacement project is estimated to be $125.5 million. A bridge demolition project is estimated to be $21.5 million

Other Considerations

The bridge was designed by renowned architect Kristoffer Olsen Oustad and built in 1929. In 1989 it was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The bridge was closed from 1970-1978 for its first major rehabiliation. That rehab is now at the end of its anticipated service life and the second rehabilitation is now needed, extending its new service life to 2056.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

City of Minneapolis

Who will operate the facility?

City of Minneapolis

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

The importance of this bridge connection cannot be understated. It serves a critical link connecting the University of Minnesota, and new and emerging developments on the East Bank to Downtown Minneapolis and other major regional assets. It also serves as an emergency alternate route including for the I-35W River Bridge; reliever to large events at the University of Minnesota and Minnesota Viking's Stadium; and connection for pedestrians and bikers wanting to cross the Mississippi River near the University of Minnesota. The annual average daily traffic count (AADT) on the bridge was 9,800 in 2012. In addition, an estimated 2,040 bike & pedestrian trips used the bridge per day in 2009.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jack Yuzna
City Bridge Engineer
612-673-2415
jack.yuzna@minneapolismn.gov

($ in thousands)

10th Avenue SE Bridge over the Mississippi River Concrete Arch Rehabilitation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$31,875	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$680	$1,105	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$2,765	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$2,318	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$3,755	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$680**	**$41,818**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$207	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$473	$6,421	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$314	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$35,083	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$680**	**$41,818**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,500
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$2.5 million in state funds is requested to develop owned land for specialty training in rail response, gas and electrical emergencies, technical rescue and tactical law enforcement. Location of project is at 25 37th Ave NE. The land necessary to complete this project has already been purchased by the City of Minneapolis and donated to the Minneapolis Fire Department. The assessed value of this land is $1,287,400.

Project Description

The Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) is a multi-agency public safety facility currently used to train first responders, fire professionals, law enforcement officials, technical rescue and hazardous materials specialists, as well as state and federal incident management personnel. The land is located in Anoka County, the City of Fridley, and operated by the City of Minneapolis, housing Minneapolis Fire Training, Emergency Management and Police Strategic Intelligence.The total project cost is $5.0 million.

The intent of this project is to develop unused, city-owned property located between the Minneapolis Water Works and the Emergency Operations Training Facility. This 1.5 acre parcel at 25 37th Ave NE, along with existing land and facilities, is ripe for development and expansion. When completed, the facility will address several areas of immediate need - large-scale transportation response, agency interoperability, tactical law enforcement, technical and structural collapse rescue. All of these training needs may be filled for multiple juridictions with this single project. While funds have been allocated to multiple training facilities across the metro and state, including Camp Ripley, none of these facilities provide the base-level, repetitive skill training in these areas that this proposed expansion can provide.

The core of this concept is an initial focus on resettable, adjustable structures such as mock building components that allow for training in short durations, with little set-up or breakdown time. Such modular structures also provide a safe, secure environment to learn skills from the most basic level through advanced training. There is nothing similar to this in the regional or the surrounding multi-state area, and the potential user list is long. A facility centrally located in the metropolitan area that can provide this wide array of training opportunities for dozens of jurisdictions is a cost and time-effective way to progressively develop skills. In conversations during conceptualization the following agencies have indicated strong verbal interest in such a site:

- BNSF Rail

  CP Rail

-
- Xcel Energy
- CenterPoint Energy
- Minneapolis Police
- Minneapolis Public Works
- St. Paul Fire
- St. Paul Police

  University of Minnesota Police
- MN Department of Public Safety
- MN State Fire Marshal's Office
- MN Task Force 1
- MN Bomb Squad
- MN Air Rescue
- MN State Patrol
- 55th CST

The support of each of these partners, whether that be in the form of user agreement or private financial/material contribution, demonstrates the clear need and the likely realization of such a project.

Project Rationale

Today, the increase in transporation of hazardous materials by rail, coupled with the on-going challenges of infrastructure, human-related and weather-related emergencies, dictate a higher level of preparedness for service providers, first responders, emergency planners and municipal leaders.

Furthermore, the recent and expected future growth of the metropolitan area, and the development of large venue structures and scheduled high profile events that accompanies this growth, creates obvious target hazard sites.

To proactively counter these new realities, a collaborative, all-hazards approach to planning and training is required, along with a facility that directly enhances the response skills of multiple partners - local, metropolitan, state and federal public safety, utility providers, and transportation agencies.

Other Considerations

- The City of St. Paul Fire Department Training Facility is in a review process for renovation or relocation. The EOTF expansion will directly augment their existing training capabilities, but more

importantly, allow them to design their future site with this training need already met. The use of this one-time appropriation will eliminate an existing redundency from the core responsibilities of each city.

- Space exists for future expansion to include facilities such as a long-barrel gun range to support Minneapolis Police and surrounding law enforcement departments.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minimal

Who will own the facility?

City of Minneapolis

Who will operate the facility?

Minneapolis Fire Department

Who will use or occupy this space?

User Agreement

Public Purpose

Training of first responders, public safety officials, utility and transportation employees in the specialty areas of technical rope, confined space, trench and structural collapse rescue, as well as utility and rail emergencies. Training can be given at base (awareness) level through advanced (technician) level, and will cover a broad base from public civil service and public safety, industry service providers, and state emergency responders. A metro location where skills may be practiced, repeated, and honed is vital. Annual or biannual training at large statewide complexes is needed. But without access to a facility to develop skills, the utility of a statewide location to demonstrate these skills will be limited. It is envisioned that such a regional facility will compliment and increase the utility of larger, statewide training facilities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

- In 2010, the Legislature appropriated $750,000 to help complete Phase I of the Regional Emergency Operations and Training Facility through the Captial Investment bill.
- In 2010, the US Department of Homeland Security awarded the EOTF approximately $1.5 million Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant to help complete Phase I of the project.
- In 2011 the facilty received a grant of $1.5 million in Port Security Grant Program

In 2011 the facility received a grant of $750,000 from the Federal Emergency Management

- Agency

Project Contact Person

Charles Brynteson
Assistant Fire Chief
612-919-7702
charles.brynteson@minneapolismn.gov

($ in thousands)

Emergency Operations Training Facility (EOTF) Enhancement

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$5,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Pioneers and Soldiers Cemetery Fence Restoration Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$609
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	The City of Minneapolis is requesting $608,516 to complete the $2.2 million fence restoration project that will help protect the public face of this landmark significant to the State of Minnesota.

Project Description

There are three parts to the project:

- Completely restore the 1,953 linear foot historic steel and limestone pillar fence that lines Pioneers and Soldiers Cemetery on Cedar Avenue and Lake Street;
- Install a new fence along 21st Avenue South to compliment the Cedar Avenue and Lake Street fence (currently there is a chain link fence);
- Install a water proofing system at the top of the historic limestone pillars to help protect the fence and pillars.

Project Rationale

Pioneers and Soldiers, originally known as Layman's Cemetery, was established in 1853. It is the oldest surviving cemetery in Minneapolis, the final resting place for over 20,000 individuals, and one of the few surviving features from the city's first period of settlement. This local Minneapolis landmark is also the only cemetery in Minnesota listed as an individual landmark on the National Register of Historic Places.

Pioneers and Soldiers Cemetery is significant for its role in the social history of Minnesota. The cemetery is ethnically diverse and contains a cross section of early Minnesotans whose efforts contributed to the early development. In addition, the Cemetery contains the graves of soldiers from the War of 1812, Civil War, and Spanish-American War.

In 1928, the City of Minneapolis took over ownership due to the cemetery's poor condition and has continued to manage the property. Unfortunately, a perpetual maintenance fund was never established when it was privately owned. This, coupled with limited room for new burials, makes the ability to raise revenue for capital improvements, like the fence restoration project, challenging if not impossible without outside funding.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Minneapolis

Who will operate the facility?

City of Minneapolis

Who will use or occupy this space?

The cemetery is open April through October. Thanks to the work of the nonprofit organization Friends of the Cemetery, thousands of people visit the cemetery annually.

Public Purpose

The fence restoration project will completely restore the highly visible public face of the cemetery and restore a greater sense of pride and ownership of this important Minnesota landmark. It will have an enduring value by protecting the final resting place of those that helped build and found this state and fight in this country's wars.

Description of Previous Appropriations

A state bonding request has not been received for this project.

Project Contact Person

Aaron Hanauer
Senior City Planner
612-673-2494
aaron.hanauer@minneapolismn.gov

($ in thousands)

Pioneers and Soldiers Cemetery Fence Restoration Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$609	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$1,544	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$1,544**	**$609**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$141	$100	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$92	$82	$0	$0
Construction	$918	$820	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	($54)	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,151**	**$948**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority Rail and Bridge Rehabiltiation Request - 2016	1	GO	$ 22,000	$ 33,000	$ 25,000
Total Project Requests			$ 22,000	$ 33,000	$ 25,000
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 22,000	$ 33,000	$ 25,000

($ in thousands)

Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority Rail and Bridge Rehabiltiation Request - 2016

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$22,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$22 million in state funds is requested for predesign, design review, replace and construct rail rehabilitation and bridge replacement for 26 miles of existing railroad track from 1912 west of Winthrop located in Sibley County MP 81.1 to Franklin, Minnesota MP 107 located in Renville County owned by the Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority.

Project Description

The Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority (MVRRA) owns 94.5 miles of track from Norwood/Young America to Hanley Falls, Minnesota. The Chicago Northwestern Railroad sold this part of the track in the 1970s. After a series of failed attempts by several rail operators, the MVRRA regained control of the property in 2002. MVRRA has leased out the railroad operations to the Minnesota Prairie Line which is a subsidiary of Twin Cities Western RR. The railroad and the shippers have been aggressively marketing the rail service. The main commodities are agriculturally based including grain, ethanol, fertilizer, and ethanol byproducts. In 2001, the track was out of service because of the condition of the track. MVRRA, MPL, and the State of Minnesota have worked diligently to complete several rehabilitation projects that have included replacing 110,000 crossties, replacing 34 miles of rail, installing 180,000 tons of ballast, rehabilitated 150 road crossings, miscellaneous bridge repair, and drainage improvements. This work has been completed as funding has become available. Funding sources have included a combination of loans and grants from the State of Minnesota, the shippers, and the Federal Government for a total investment to date of $29 million

Project Rationale

This project is needed to bring our track up to 286,000 lb capacity, increase speed from 7-10 mile per hour to 25 miles per hour, and insure safety of the track. Our project has been included in the 2015 Minnesota Dept of Transportation State Freight Rail Plan, and we have just completed a track condition upgrade report with Short Elliot Henderson. Our projections of the cost to complete this next section of track from Winthrop to Franklin is $22M.

Other Considerations

Track condition has improved with the installation of over 110,000 crossties, 34 miles of replacement rail, and 180,000 tons of ballast but similar to an old house, ongoing maintenance and improvements are required. The crossties replaced amount to about 40 percent of the crossties in the system. The completed rehabilitation projects have allowed the track to meet FRA Class 2 standards between Norwood/Young America and Winthrop, and Class I standards between Winthrop and Hanley Falls. The MPL operating contract requires a minimum level of normal maintenance, but this will not allow

for substantial improvements to the track. Their level of maintenance expenditures is determined by the level of car loadings. Currently they are replacing about 4,000 crossties per year and several miles of track surfacing. Rail condition is a concern. Generally, rail under 110# is not capable of handling 286,000# loads. Replacing rail with a minimum size of 115# rail should be a top priority. In conjunction with any rail replacement, turnouts, road crossings, ballast, and track surfacing will need to be completed on the remaining 64 miles of track to maintain the investment and allow for increase in train speed. Increase in rail traffic will also necessitate work on the sidings to allow for efficient switching of rail cars. With 60+ miles yet to rehabilitate, any gap in finding will impact the cost and the schedule of the continued restoration of our line. We will be providing you our complete updated track report with the full report upon your request and review of this preliminary budget request.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

As a local unit of government, MVRRA is requesting $22 million in state bonding funds to make the necessary improvements to increase rail shipments, and business opportunities to locate and help existing businesses along our line to expand. In doing so, this will increase the operating budget of the Rail Authority by becoming a viable rail line for all 16 communities it serves.

Who will own the facility?

Minnesota Valley Regional Railroad Authority which was statutorily formed by the State of Minnesota in 1982, and included Carver, Sibley, Renville, Redwood, and Yellow Medicine Counties

Who will operate the facility?

MVRRA has an operator's contract in place with Minnesota Prairie Line located in Glencoe, MN.

Who will use or occupy this space?

This railroad is publicly owned by the 5 counties – Carver, Sibley, Redwood, Renville, and Yellow Medicine. Increase private investment by shippers has already occurred and more is schedule to occur in the next 2-5 years based on the ability of MVRRA to secure additional funding to complete the rehabilitation of the remaining 60+miles of rail and bridges.

Public Purpose

To provide a viable freight transportation corridor for all shippers in our 16 communities and 5 counties to compete globally in getting their products to markets in a timely and efficient manner and to reduce truck traffic which will save on Minnesota highways and county roads.

Description of Previous Appropriations

2002: $6,000,000 – State GO Bonds; FRA, Shippers investment; Railroad

2003: $27,609 – Hwy 22 crossing

2002: $1,000,000.00 – Federal Rail Administration

2004 $1,987,000.00 -- Federal Rail Administration

2005: $2,000,000.00 -- Federal Rail Administration

2006: $ 495,000.00 -- Federal Rail Administration

2008: $3,000,000.00 – State GO Bonds

2009: $2,500,000.00 – FRA/ARRA funds2009: $4,000,000.00 – State GO Bonds

2009: $950,000.00 – FRA

2009: $4,000,000.00 -- State GO Bonds

2010: $5,000,000.00-- State GO Bonds

2010: $1,000,000.00 -- Federal FRA funds - appropriation

2011: $20,000.00 – FHWA – Arlington signal match

2015: $1,000,000.00 -- State GO Bonds - just approved end of 2015 session

TOTAL: $29,979,609.00 Funding from State and Federal funds to date.

Project Contact Person

Julie Rath or Bob Fox
Administrator; MVRRA Board Chair
507-637-4084
julie@redwoodfalls.org

($ in thousands)

Minnesota Valley Regional Rail Authority Rail and Bridge Rehabiltiation Request - 2016

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$6	$22,000	$33,000	$25,000
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$6**	**$22,000**	**$33,000**	**$25,000**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$767	$1,138	$871
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$21,481	$31,867	$24,380
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,888	$4,284	$3,278
TOTAL	**$0**	**$25,136**	**$37,289**	**$28,529**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Montevideo, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Montevideo Flood Control Project	1	GO	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
Montevideo Veterans Home	2	GO	$ 5,208	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 8,208	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 8,208	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Montevideo Flood Control Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Flood Control Project to protect the City of Montevideo

Project Description

Construction on the project has been proceeding in stages since 2009 as funding has become available. The Stage 3 work includes raising the 1969 levee both north and south of Highway 212/3; raising River Road SW; construction of gatewell 2 and its outlet ditch at the 1969 levee south of Highway 212/3; construction of an interior drainage ponding area bounded by River Road SW on the east, by the 1969 levee on the south, and by Gravel Road on the north; construction of a railroad closure structure where the railroad tracks cross Trunk Highway 7/29 at the existing levee near the Chippewa River. In order to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Corps will conduct archeological mitigation excavation next spring in the gatewell 2 outlet ditch alignment prior to construction of that feature.

Project Rationale

The Final Phase of the Montevideo Flood Control Project is the culmination of almost 20 years of work by the city, State, and Federal Government to complete the construction of a levee system that will protect the city from a 100 year flood. The city has been called as a federal disaster area 6 time in the last 15 years. Work already completed on the levee has greatly impacted the cost to fight and rebuild after each flood,but the levee system is not completed and lacks final funding to get it completed.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Completion of the levee will keep future local, State and Federal costs lower as flood fighing costs will diminish.

Who will own the facility?

City of Montevideo

Who will operate the facility?

City of Montevideo

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Flood Control

Description of Previous Appropriations

The state has previously funded portions of the project from both the pending bill and state DNR flood mitigation funding. Federal funding has ended on this project.

Project Contact Person

Steven Jones
City Manager
320-269-6575
citymgr@montevideomn.org

($ in thousands)

Montevideo Flood Control Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$263	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,263**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Montevideo Veterans Home

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$5,208
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$5,208,570 in state funds is requested to design, construct, furnish and equip a new Veterans home for the Department of Veterans Affairs in Montevideo

Project Description

From the larger city context the immediate community has amenities which will enrich the resident's social, educational, spiritual, and recreational needs. William Avenue provides the organization spine for community activity; the middle school, high school, athletic fields, the armory, and natural park settings to the north all offer opportunities for social engagement. Open space to the south, east, and west offer outdoor opportunities via bike trails and walking paths to nature preserves.

The proposed 70 bed Veterans Home provides state-of-the-art social and operational organization with four neighborhood clusters, all equal distance from communal space which includes an exercise center. The building provides passive solar design and is a platform for future solar thermal collectors. The site plan provides for geothermal heating and wind turbine generated power.

The Veterans Home is located on a 13.5 acre site purchased by the City of Montevideo on the southeast corner of the city limits. The location is in the growing eastern edge of the city on former farmland. The site is well positioned for residents to participate in community activities as part of the City's desire to have a Veteran Friendly Community. By using the local taxi and van services, residents can easily access: the commercial main street, the Chippewa County Fairgrounds, the cultural center, the fine arts center, and to the north the new hospital and Veterans Affairs Community Based Outpatient Clinic (CBOC).

Total Square Footage: 97, 850 sq. ft.

Estimated Project Cost for New VA Home in Montevideo: $30,716,000

Federal Share (2/3):

$20,475,285

State Share (1/3):

$10,240,715

(Of the state share we have committed funds and local cost to date of $5,032,145)

State Share after local contribution:

$5,208,570

Regional Commitment & Support of Veterans Home Proposal

The aim of our proposal is to show our elected officials that this is a broadly supported proposal both in terms of type of entity but also geographically. While we have not been able to approach all of the organizations we intend to, the presented list is comprehensive consisting of different levels of government, private institutions, and state agencies as well as housing and educational entities from across the region.

The following organizations have pledged financial or material support to the Veterans home proposal.

Supporting Entities

Non Profit/ Community Groups

American Legion Post 59

VFW Post 380

Montevideo & Watson Lions Club

7th District American Legion

(14 Counties, 77 Posts, 6,300 members)

Southwest Minnesota Housing Partnership

Willmar Disabled American Veterans (DAV)

Montevideo Chippewa County Hospital

Montevideo Chippewa County Library

Education/ State Entities

MN Department of Veterans Affairs

MN Department of Employment & Economic Development

MN West Community & Technical College

Ridgewater Community & Technical College

University of Minnesota Extension Office

Economic Development Agencies

Montevideo Industrial Development Corporation

Montevideo Community Development Corporation

Montevideo Economic Development Authority

Units of Government

Chippewa County

Lac Qui Parle County

Yellow Medicine County

Swift County

Renville County

City of Montevideo

City of Clara City

City of Granite Falls

City of Marshall

Chippewa County Townships(40)

Private Institutions

KleinBank

Minnwest Bank

Montevideo Coop Credit Union

Short Elliot Hendrickson

Veterans Friendly Community: 40 Businesses

World War II & Korean War Coffee Group

Montevideo Chamber of Commerce

Project Rationale

Montevideo has a complete plan in place to build and support operations of the next Veterans Home in our community. The need for a Veterans Home is proven. Our community has purchased land, committed over five million dollars to the project and is ready to serve as the next location for a Minnesota Veterans Home. There are over 12,000 Veterans and 12

National Guard or Reserve Units within a 60 minute driving distance of Montevideo.

According to the United States Department of Veterans Affairs statistics Veteran Population Model 2011, which estimates living Veterans in Minnesota from 2010-2040, there will be an estimated 386,598 Veterans. Of these, about 42% (162,924) are under the age of 60 and 58% (223,674) are over the age of 60. This aging population will put more strain on the states Veterans Homes. Some Veterans of Operation Iraqi Freedom have more severe wounds than in previous generations and may require skilled care at younger ages.

The current waiting list to receive 1 of the 860 beds in a Minnesota Veterans Home includes over 1,000 individuals. Minnesota has five Veterans Homes with care ranging from skilled to domiciliary. An increasing number of disabilities are connected to military service and often require more skilled nursing care. The five current Veterans Homes have a total of 860 beds. This is an average of only one bed for 431 of Minnesota's Veterans. While not all of our brave men and women require skilled nursing home care, it is a safe bet that more than 1 out of 430 will at some time in their life. Montevideo is ready to provide Minnesota's Veterans with the care they need and deserve.

Other Considerations

Why build a Montevideo Veterans Home?

For the Veterans! Current estimates state there are 369,000 Veterans living in the State of Minnesota. If even one half of one percent require long-term care and choose a Veterans home that would require 1,845 beds. Currently, between Minnesota's five Veterans homes, there are an estimated 860 beds.

Who pays for and who owns the Veterans Home?

The Veterans Home is a state owned facility. Construction costs are split between the federal and state governments. Current cost estimates indicate a $20,475,285 federal commitment and a $10,240,715 state commitment for the project for a TOTAL project, cost of $30,716,000. Of the state share we have financial commitments and costs to date of $5,032,145.

If the state and federal government own and pay for the construction cost, why are we being asked to contribute financially to this project?

The Minnesota State Legislature enacts legislation stating that a home will be built and WHERE it will be built. To help our chances with placing a Veterans home in our region, we are paying a portion of the state's cost to help improve the chances of the state agreeing to the project.

Where will the facility be built?

The City of Montevideo has donated land (approximately 13.5 acres) located on the corner of County Road 15 and William Avenue.

Why should the facility be constructed in Montevideo?

1. There are many reasons! First, Montevideo has one of the twelve Veterans Administration Community Based Outpatient Clinic's that are located in Minnesota. Therefore, transporting Veterans from the home to receive medical attention would be cost and time efficient. We also have the new $40 million dollar Chippewa County Montevideo Hospital healthcare facility located in Montevideo.

2. We fit the guidelines! State and Federal guidelines dictate that the facilities must be at least 100 miles or a two-hour drive from the next-closest home.

3. Montevideo would serve over 12,000 Veterans within a 60 minute drive time. Also, there is not another Veterans Home within two hours in every direction of Montevideo. Montevideo also has 12 National Guard and Reserve units a 60 minute drive time of Montevideo.

4. Community Support! Montevideo has always been a "Pro-Veteran" community as evident through their active service clubs, Veterans Friendly Community designation, Beyond the Yellow Ribbon designation, the placement of the clinic and monuments erected around town, all of which go towards creating a friendly and welcoming experience for area Veterans.

How many jobs will be created if the Veterans home is constructed in Montevideo?

The Montevideo Community Development Corporation hired the University of Minnesota to conduct an Economic Impact Analysis. Their study found that 205 jobs would be created at the facility itself!

Does the Montevideo region have the workforce capable of supporting the Veterans home?

According to Minnesota Department of Employment & Economic Development, currently in Region 6W, the six counties in and around Montevideo, there are 297 people actively seeking employment in healthcare related positions. In this same region, there are 386 people willing to work in zip code 56265 (Montevideo).

What else did the Economic Impact Analysis state?

Among many positives, the highlights include:

- Output in the local economy to increase by $11.7 Million dollars annually.
- Labor income in the local economy is expected to increase by nearly $8 Million annually.
- Output in the local economy is expected to increase by $20+ Million due to the

CONSTRUCTION of the facility using 200+ construction workers.

Is there adequate housing available if this facility were to be constructed?

Southwest Minnesota Housing Partnership has drafted a project agreement which outlines a commitment contingent on construction of the home. The commitment calls for an assessment of the REGIONAL housing opportunities. Based off these findings a Regional Action Plan will be drafted. Finally, based off the action plan the SWMHP has committed to constructing, rehabbing the necessary housing identified within the action plan.

Have higher education facilities been informed of the proposed Veterans home?

Yes! Meetings have and will take place with regional educational partners, including Ridgewater Community & Technical College and Minnesota West Community Technical College. The purpose of these discussions is to ensure that if this proposal moves forward there are adequate classes being offered and training/employment opportunities being explored to the fullest degree possible.

Who is completing this predesign?

Short Elliot Hendrickson (SEH), a top notch architectural and engineering firm from Minneapolis, has been hired and continues to do plan updates. In turn they have sought the nation's foremost experts on extended care and Veterans home design.

Does the facility use GREEN/LEED building techniques?

Yes! Due to cost the building as presented will not be LEED certified but it will be *certifiable*. The predesign calls for solar collectors, geothermal heating and cooling as well as a wind turbine to build on site.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

New state operating dollars will be similar to other Veterans Homes in the state. The City of Montevideo's request is for the operation of a 70 bed Veterans home.

Who will own the facility?

State of Minnesota, Department of Veterans Affairs

Who will operate the facility?

State of Minnesota, Department of Veterans Affairs

Who will use or occupy this space?

NONE

Public Purpose

Nursing Home Care for Veterans

Description of Previous Appropriations

NONE

Project Contact Person

Angie Steinbach
Community Development Director
320-269-6575
cdd@montevideomn.org

($ in thousands)

Montevideo Veterans Home

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$5,208	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$2,033	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$20,476	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,241**	**$20,476**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$730	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$3,153	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$860	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$23,623	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$2,350	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$6,367	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$37,083**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Unsure
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Moorhead, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
SE Main Ave/20th St/21st St Railroad Grade Separation	1	GO	$ 42,262	$ 0	$ 0
11th St Railroad Grade Separation	2	GO	$ 13,548	$ 60,966	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 55,810	$ 60,966	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 55,810	$ 60,966	$ 0

($ in thousands)

SE Main Ave/20th St/21st St Railroad Grade Separation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$42,262
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$42.262 million in state funds is requested to construct railroad grade separations of the BNSF Railway Moorhead Subdivision and Otter Tail Valley Railroad tracks at the skewed intersection of SE Main Ave and 20th/21st St in the City of Moorhead. The BNSF Railway Moorhead Subdivision and Otter Tail Valley Railroad tracks will also be connected to the BNSF Railway K.O. Subdivision mainline tracks via a railroad wye.

Project Description

SE Main Ave is a four-lane urban minor arterial that approaches Downtown Moorhead from the southeast. 20th St/21st St is a north-south four-lane urban minor arterial east of Downtown Moorhead. A diagonal connection between 20th St and 21st St comprises the intersection with SE Main Ave. This is a signalized intersection with dedicated turn lanes and a “free right turn” lane from eastbound SE Main Ave to southbound 20th St and from northbound SE Main Ave to 21st St. The Otter Tail Valley Railroad tracks (which approach the intersection from the southeast) merge with the BNSF Railway Moorhead Subdivision tracks (which approach the intersection from the south) northwest of this intersection. Further west, these tracks then merge with the BNSF Railway K.O. Subdivision mainline tracks. Due to the geometric configuration of the streets and tracks, railroad gates cannot be installed at the existing crossings.

The proposed project includes construction of grade separations (underpasses) of the BNSF Railway Moorhead Subdivision and Otter Tail Valley Railroad tracks at the skewed intersection of SE Main Ave and 20th St/21st St. The grade separation project will enable high volumes of vehicular traffic, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles to safely and efficiently pass below bridges that will carry these two freight rail lines. The project also includes a wye rail connection which will improve regional freight operations by allowing trains to directly travel northbound to eastbound and westbound to southbound eliminating a “backing” movement that blocks three to five high volume at-grade railroad crossings in Downtown Moorhead. The project includes construction of sidewalks and trails along SE Main Ave, 20th St, and 21st St which will close gaps in the metropolitan bicycle/pedestrian system and greatly improve bicycle/pedestrian safety. Finally, the project includes the construction of various ancillary improvements such as a stormwater pump station and discharge pipes, retaining walls, and related utility relocations.

Work on the project was initiated in 2002. Since that time, the following activities have been completed:

- Preliminary design & environmental assessment
- Right-of-way acquisition
- Final design

Approximately $6.6 million has been invested to date. No state capital budget funding has been used to complete this work.

The total cost to construct the project is estimated to be $50.762 million. Proposed funding includes:

- State capital budget request: $42.262 million
- BNSF statutory match (5% of bridge structures): $1.7 million
- BNSF negotiated match (closure of the 1st Ave S at-grade crossing): $1.0 million
- City/local funds: $5.8 million

Project Rationale

The City of Moorhead is bisected by five active freight rail lines. In 2014, these tracks averaged 85 through-trains per day including five to seven trains per day carrying oil shipments originating in the State of North Dakota. By 2040, the number of through-trains is projected to grow to 151 per day. Significant rail presence in the City, intensified by the increasing flow of North Dakota crude oil, negatively affects vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic safety and operations, is a barrier to emergency services and first responders, and is detrimental to quality of life and economic vitality. These negative impacts are magnified by a variety of border city economic and competitive disparities including, but not limited to, significant investments in infrastructure funded by the State of North Dakota and by local North Dakota dedicated sales taxes.

Over the past three or more decades, the City of Moorhead has made significant investments to incrementally implement elements of a comprehensive strategy to mitigate the impacts of heavily-used freight lines running through the heart of the City, while maximizing vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. These projects include grade separations of the BNSF Railway K.O. Subdivision mainline at 3rd St, 20th St, and 34th St, a new interchange at 34th St & I-94, and a Downtown quiet zone project incorporating various vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety improvements. The future vision of this long-term strategy includes construction of the SE Main Ave/20th St/21st St railroad grade separation and construction of a Downtown (11th St) railroad grade separation.

The proposed SE Main Ave/20th St/21st St railroad grade separation was identified as a top priority project in the *Report on the Improvements to Highway-Rail Grade Crossings and Rail Safety* released by MnDOT in December 2014. The top priority projects were compiled from findings indicating chronic and prolonged grade crossing blockages on high traffic railroad mainlines, especially those shipping crude oil, which pose a substantial risk for emergency responders and the community.

By eliminating existing conflicts between trains, automobiles, trucks, buses, bicycles, and pedestrians, overall community safety will be improved and transportation system reliability, mobility, and connectivity will be increased. The project provides numerous regional and local transportation, economic, and public safety benefits:

- Traffic congestion and delay will be reduced by more than 431 vehicle hours traveled per day.
- Commuter travel times will be reduced during the pm peak hour by 271 vehicle hours traveled per day.
- Unacceptable levels of service (LOS; rated A-F) at key intersection will be improved (LOS D & F for no-build conditions to B & C under build conditions).
- The grade separation, including a negotiated crossing closure at 1st Ave S, will eliminate 412,000 current auto-rail exposures.
- A high crash site (131 vehicle crashes since 2005, 11 auto/rail crashes since 1978) will be addressed.
- Safety for over 130 school buses, carrying nearly 2,000 students across railroad tracks daily, will be improved.
- The railroad wye will eliminate crossing blockages at three to five high volume at-grade crossings in Downtown Moorhead.
- Headway reliability for regular, fixed-route transit service will improve by eliminating conflicts due to uncertain arrival of trains.
- The railroad wye will “free-up” significant mainline capacity (estimated at 2.5 hours per day or about 10 percent of mainline time).
- The project will provide substantial emergency response benefits by reducing delay and improving response times.
- Hazardous material loads from the City’s industrial park (approximately 75 trucks per day) will be moved more safely past educational facilities and neighborhoods.
- Environmental benefits will be realized by reduced energy consumption and improved air quality because the long and frequent vehicle queues at the blocked rail crossings will be eliminated.
- Modal connectivity (bicycles, pedestrians, and transit) will be improved.
- Industrial park access and economic development opportunities will be enhanced.

Other Considerations

The City has unsuccessfully sought other sources of funding including Federal funding assistance (TIGER grant applications in 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014).

Due previous investments, the project is “shovel-ready”. Once funding is secured, construction could begin within six months.

The costs associated with the documented need for two railroad grade separation projects within the City of Moorhead is far beyond the City’s local financial capacity. The proposed local match for these projects is current included in this (the City’s Priority #1) capital budget request. The local match can be fully allocated to one project or split between the two projects.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The project will not result in requests for new or additional state operating funds.

Who will own the facility?

City of Moorhead, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Moorhead, MN

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A. The project will benefit, and be used by, the traveling public.

Public Purpose

The project will improve transportation system safety, reliability, mobility, and connectivity by eliminating conflicts between trains, automobiles, trucks, buses, bicycles, and pedestrians. The project will directly improve regional economic vitality, community safety, and quality of life.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Work to date ($6.6 million) includes no previous appropriations of state capital budget funds. Preliminary design, environmental assessment, right-of-way acquisition, and final design were completed with a combination of Federal funds, Municipal State Aid Street funds, and local funds.

Project Contact Person

Michael Redlinger
City Manager
218-299-5305
michael.redlinger@ci.moorhead.mn.us

($ in thousands)

SE Main Ave/20th St/21st St Railroad Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$42,262	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$5,449	$0	$0	$0
City Funds	$1,228	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$5,800	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$2,700	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$6,677**	**$50,762**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$4,065	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$2,612	$3,440	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$39,560	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$7,762	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$6,677**	**$50,762**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

11th St Railroad Grade Separation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$13,548
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$13.548 million in state funds (2016-2017) is requested to complete preliminary engineering, environmental assessment, right-of-way acquisition, and final design for railroad grade separations of the BNSF Railway K.O. Subdivision mainline and Prosper Subdivision tracks at 11th St in the City of Moorhead. A future request (2018-2019) for $60.966 million in state funds is anticipated to construct the project.

Project Description

11th St, 1st Ave N, and Main Ave are currently four-lane urban minor arterials. Center Ave (currently designated as TH 10/75) is a four-lane principal arterial, and is part of the National Highway System. All intersections within the project area are currently signalized but suffer delay and congestion primarily related to train induced delay.

The 11th St grade separation project proposes the construction of two railroad grade separations (underpasses) in Downtown Moorhead. The project would construct two separate railroad bridges to carry the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline and the BNSF Railway Prosper Subdivision tracks over 11th St which intersects Main Ave, Center Ave (TH10/75), and 1st Ave N. The project would accommodate the imminent shift of TH 10/75 from its current at- grade crossing of the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline from 8th St to 11th St. The project will enable high volumes of vehicular traffic, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles to safely and efficiently pass below bridges that will carry these two freight rail lines. The project includes construction of sidewalks and trails which will close gaps in the metropolitan bicycle/pedestrian system and greatly improve bicycle/pedestrian safety. Finally, the project includes the construction of various ancillary improvements such as a stormwater pump station and discharge pipes, and related utility relocations.

An Alternatives Development & Evaluation Study was initiated in 2014 and is intended to provide basic information necessary for future environmental assessment documentation. This joint effort is being funded by the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments ($141,455 in Federal CPG funds), City of Moorhead ($75,000), and MnDOT ($50,000). No state capital budget funding has been requested or is being used for this work.

The total cost to construct the project is estimated to be $74.514 million. The City is requesting capital budget funding assistance in this amount (less a yet-to-be determined BNSF Railway statutory cost-share of 5% of the bridge structures). The 2016-2017 capital budget funding request for the project will be used for the following activities:

Preliminary engineering and environmental assessment: $4.0 million

- Right-of-way acquisition: $3.0 million
- Final design: $3.0 million
- Inflationary adjustment: $3.548 million

Project Rationale

The City of Moorhead is bisected by five active freight rail lines. In 2014, these tracks averaged 85 through-trains per day (including five to seven trains per day carrying oil shipments originating in the State of North Dakota) resulting in 106 railroad crossing blockages per day. By 2040, the number of through-trains is projected to grow to 151 per day and the number of crossing blockages to 187 per day. Significant rail presence in the City, intensified by the increasing flow of North Dakota crude oil, negatively affects vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic safety and operations, is a barrier to emergency services and first responders, and is detrimental to quality of life and economic vitality. These negative impacts are magnified by a variety of border city economic and competitive disparities including, but not limited to, significant investments in infrastructure funded by the State of North Dakota and by local North Dakota dedicated sales taxes.

Over the past three or more decades, the City of Moorhead has made significant investments to incrementally implement elements of a comprehensive strategy to mitigate the impacts of heavily-used freight lines running through the heart of the City, while maximizing vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety. These projects include grade separations of the BNSF Railway K.O. Subdivision mainline at 3rd St, 20th St, and 34th St, a new interchange at 34th St & I-94, and a Downtown quiet zone project incorporating various vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian safety improvements. The future vision of this long-term strategy includes construction of the SE Main Ave/20th St/21st St railroad grade separation and construction of a Downtown (11th St) railroad grade separation.

The proposed 11th St railroad grade separation was identified as a top priority project in the *Report on the Improvements to Highway-Rail Grade Crossings and Rail Safety* released by MnDOT in December 2014. The top priority projects were compiled from findings indicating chronic and prolonged grade crossing blockages on high traffic railroad mainlines, especially those shipping crude oil, which pose a substantial risk for emergency responders and the community.

By eliminating existing conflicts between trains, automobiles, trucks, buses, bicycles, and pedestrians, overall community safety will be improved and transportation system reliability, mobility, and connectivity will be increased. The project provides numerous regional and local transportation, economic, and public safety benefits:

- The project improves regional and local transportation system connectivity and continuity. 11th St serves as a primary north-south corridor with segments in the project area designated as a County State Aid Highway (CSAH) for Clay County and a Minnesota State Aid Street (MSAS) for the City of Moorhead.
- The project will improve connectivity and operations for MnDOT TH 10 and TH 75, which are part of the National Highway System (NHS). Although the TH 10/75 designation currently follows an 8th St alignment across the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline, conceptual plans have been developed to incrementally shift the TH 10/75 designation to follow Main Ave to 11th St and cross the BNSF Railway KO Subdivision mainline at that location. Therefore, the TH 10/75 designation would follow the eventual location for a grade separation in Downtown Moorhead.
- The project will reduce train induced vehicle delay, which exceeds the recommended threshold in the FHWA Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook for both existing and future conditions. A

grade separation will reduce the number of crossing exposures minimizing the risk of train/vehicle accidents.

- The project improves Metro Area Transit (MATBUS) service by eliminating street system discontinuity, providing for more fluid north-south transit operations, and improving schedule reliability.
- The project provides improved connectivity for non-motorized transportation users, including bicycles and pedestrians, that are most acutely affected by changes in distance traveled.
- The project allows the City of Moorhead to plan confidently for future development and reinvestment in this area. The project removes concerns regarding safety and traffic mobility with in Downtown Moorhead and improves the opportunity for private sector reinvestment and business development.
- The project is supported by the Metro 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan. By reducing train delay and related traffic congestion, the project will improve the social and environmental quality of life in Moorhead's Downtown business district.
- Environmental benefits will be realized by reduced energy consumption and improved air quality because the long and frequent vehicle queues at the blocked rail crossings will be eliminated.

Specific measurable benefits include:

- Daily train-related delay in 2040 is projected to be reduced from 488 vehicle-hours to 253 vehicle-hours (48% reduction).
- Network wide delay in 2040 is projected to be reduced from 68.7 seconds per vehicle to 57 seconds per vehicle (17% reduction) in the AM peak hour, and reduced from 165.6 seconds per vehicle to 118.1 seconds per vehicle (28.7% reduction) in the PM peak hour.
- Daily railroad crossing exposures in 2040 are projected to be reduced from 3,984,100 to 2,052,000 (48% reduction).
- A grade separation at 11th St greatly reduces emergency response times and increases response time reliability.

Other Considerations

The costs associated with the documented need for two railroad grade separation projects within the City of Moorhead is far beyond the City's local financial capacity. The proposed local match for these projects is current included in the City's Priority #1 capital budget request. The local match can be fully allocated to one project or split between the two projects.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The project will not result in requests for new or additional state operating funds.

Who will own the facility?

City of Moorhead, MN

Who will operate the facility?

City of Moorhead, MN

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A. The project will benefit, and be used by, the traveling public.

Public Purpose

The project will improve transportation system safety, reliability, mobility, and connectivity by eliminating conflicts between trains, automobiles, trucks, buses, bicycles, and pedestrians. The project will directly improve regional economic vitality, community safety, and quality of life.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Work to date includes no previous appropriations of state capital budget funds.

Project Contact Person

Michael Redlinger
City Manager
218-299-5305
michael.redlinger@ci.moorhead.mn.us

($ in thousands)

11th St Railroad Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$13,548	$60,966	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Trunk Highway Cash	$50	$0	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$141	$0	$0	$0
City Funds	$75	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$266**	**$13,548**	**$60,966**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$266	$7,000	$3,600	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$41,400	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$3,548	$15,966	$0
TOTAL	**$266**	**$13,548**	**$60,966**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Moose Lake, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Riverside Center Addition	1	GO	$ 600	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 600	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 600	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Riverside Center Addition

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$600
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $600,000 in state funding to design, construct and equip a 5,000 square foot, $1.2 million energy efficient and ADA compliant addition to Riverside Center for public restrooms, community room, and men's and women's changing rooms, to serve the area of Northern Pine and Southern Carlton counties in the City of Moose Lake. This will be the 3rd time the City of Moose Lake has requested State appropriations for this project.

Project Description

Currently, the facility is 26,400 square feet. The current request is for an additional 5,000 square feet to expand community areas, offices, and locker room space. The City would also be investing in the road leading to the arena (Earl Ellens Drive) and parking lot for the new facility. Part of the building is in the flood zone and was affected by the 2012 Flood. The addition will construct the facility out of the flood zone.

The City of Moose Lake is proposing a $ 1.2 million project of which $ 600,000 would be from the State Bond. Besides the State Bond investment, the balance for the project would come from a GO Bond paid by a city supported levy and / or city reserves. The City of Moose Lake is 70 % tax exempt. However, the Riverside Arena building is a regional center for sports, training, and events.

The City of Moose Lake hired the 292 Group to design an Arena expansion project, including taking the project to an engineering design and through a Request for Proposal (RFP) advertisement and bid process this year. This project is shovel ready.

Project Rationale

The communities throughout the region are enthusiastically working together on the renovation and redevelopment of Riverside Center. This is an opportunity to diversify and maximize the use of the facility and help provide recreational opportunity for all ages. This regional event center and recreational complex are a shining example of how cooperation among individuals, businesses, foundations and government can result in an environmentally and economically sustainable facility.

History: The original Riverside Center was built 25 years ago with active city and community cooperation involving many volunteers combined with private and business contributions. A 4400-square-foot addition and ice plant were added in 1995, again with immense community and volunteer effort along with a state grant. The center remains a great community asset. The current winter programs serve over 150 youth, ages pre-school through high school including skating for physical education classes, after-school AmeriCorps opportunities, broomball for regional teams,

adult and senior hockey, figure skating and community public skating. In the summer the facility is used for a large variety of regional recreational, entertainment and business events, including car sales and shows, community concerts, weekly farmers' market, business expo's and roller skating . All of these uses enhance the community, bring in new visitors and increase the region's economic base.

Phase I, which started in the fall of 2010, is making the existing Riverside Center and Park more energy efficient and economically sustainable by reducing energy costs and utilizing community resources more efficiently. This area has been renovated under Phase I for energy efficiency and modernization. Included are new interior and exterior lighting, new ceiling insulation, and replacement of doors and update of HVAC system. This has allowed the facility to increase year-round use and provide an environmentally safer and healthier recreational center for all ages.

The improvements are being funded with widespread, diverse community and regional support incorporating in-kind labor and materials and private and business contributions along with foundation and grant support. Key contributors have been the Northland Foundation, which, through community forums developed the design and architectural plans, and the Northern Minnesota Sustainable Development Project (NMSDP), which has assisted in developing a sustainable business model for the facility.

Phase II will complete a Riverside Center addition of 5000 square feet. The addition will include public restrooms, a concessions area, lobby area/community room along with women's and men's changing rooms. It will also include accessible walkways connecting the center entrance with other areas of the park, and covered outdoor space for farmers market.

This entire project, located in a low income and under-served area of southern Carlton and northern Pine counties, will connect a Minnesota "Fit City" to the region and provide all ages a gathering spot for exercise, education, commerce and socialization.

Other Considerations

The City of Moose Lake has been innovative in securing grants and donations. The only alternative to receiving State Bond Funds opportunities for funding this project is to increase in tax levied dollars. As the City of Moose Lake is 70 % tax exempt this would a difficult investment for the city. This is an excellent State Bond investment as this building is used by citizens in the region. This investment will also result in an addition that will construct the building outside the flood zone.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This is an opportunity to diversify and maximize the use of the facility and to help provide event and recreational opportunity all year round. Because of the ongoing investment being made by the City of Moose Lake, this is a onetime bond request for completing the project. No future additional state operating dollars will be requested.

Who will own the facility?

City of Moose Lake

Who will operate the facility?

City of Moose Lake

Who will use or occupy this space?

The private sector currently rents the facility year round for athletic tournaments, sales events, musical entertainments, weddings / reunions, and farmers markets. The Moose Lake Area Hockey Association is a private nonprofit corporation that rents the facility for youth hockey training.

Public Purpose

The Independent School District No.97 rents the facility for hockey games, physical education, athletic training, and community education activities. The City of Moose Lake sponsors public skating, intramural athletic events, and 4th of July musical concerts for the Public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The City of Moose have made two previous bonding requests both unsuccessful. Also, the Governor's office request a review in 2015 for limited bonding assistance, however that was also unsuccessful.

Project Contact Person

Jean Hedin
City Administrator
218-485-4010
cityofml@lcp2.net

($ in thousands)

Riverside Center Addition

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$600	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$600	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,200**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$76	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,050	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$74	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,200**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Morris, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Morris Water Treatment Facility	1	GO	$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Morris Water Treatment Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$7,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$7 million in state funds is requested to design and construct a new regional water treatment facility to meet the MPCA Discharge requirements for the residents, businesses and institutions in the City of Morris. This environmental protection project will improve the Pomme de Terre River quality at Morris, but also throughout the Upper Midwest.

Project Description

The proposed Morris Water Treatment facility is being developed by the City of Morris as a new regional water treatment plant to serve area residents, businesses, and institutions. The new facility will be a lime/soda ash softening water treatment facility to comply with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agencies NPDES permit for discharge of chlorides to the Pomme de Terre River (this project is being required by the MPCA to meet discharge limits). By softening the drinking water in the City of Morris, salt used in home water softeners will be decreased allowing the permit discharge requirements to be met. This will help protect the environment while also providing a higher quality drinking water to the residents and businesses in and around Morris (and Alberta). In addition, this project will also replace the aging infrastructure of the existing iron and manganese treatment facility that is approximately 40 years old.

While compliance with the City's NPDES permit and replacing old infrastructure are two of the driving factors for the project, another significant aspect of this facility is the regional impact it will have on the area. The proposed facility will provide a softened water supply for the University of MN Morris, allowing this campus to significantly decrease the amount of salt it uses in its softeners. This will help the campus be more environmentally friendly and save costs on salt and softening equipment. The proposed treatment plant will also allow the regional ethanol plant DENCO II to utilize the softened water for its employees and ethanol production. This will have a significant impact on the area in a number of ways including:

- DENCO II will be able to abandon their well and much of their water treatment process allowing them to decrease water usage.
- DENCO II wastewater discharge quality will be better, allowing them to meet MPCA's requirements for chlorides (this is a major issue, as without this water supply the facility could be in danger of shutting down as compliance with their NPDES permit could not be obtained cost effectively).
- By allowing DENCO II to meet their NPDES permit cost effectively, a large regional business will be able to maintain its workforce of 35 employees. It also allows area farms from up to 50 miles away to continue selling grain.
- Ultimately, DENCO II affects well over 300 families in western Minnesota over a 50 mile radius surrounding Morris.

The Morris facility also provides water to other regional businesses and communities like Superior

Industries, Stevens Community Medical Center, and Alberta, MN. The City of Alberta is a small rural community that connected to Morris' water supply as they could not afford to support their own water infrastructure. The cost of this project will have a direct impact on these residents as well. The success and affordability of this water treatment plant is important to the region and therefore needs the support of the state.

The anticipated cost of the facility is approximately $12 million dollars. Based on the approximate cost of $12 million, the current project is beyond the State of Minnesota's affordability of 1.4% of the median household income. According to the US Census Bureau website, the median household income is $43,958, at 1.4%, this would mean each household could afford water rates of approximately $51.28 per month. With capital costs and operation and maintenance costs of the new facility, the annual cost for Morris would be approximately $1,400,000 per year. This translates into a monthly cost of approximately $68 per month (or more) for each user.

To make this project affordable for area businesses and residents that need the project to meet requirements, and impact the environment positively, approximately $7 million dollars in State bonding is needed. This investment by the state would impact over 6,000 Minnesota residents and businesses positively and keep a major regional rural hub viable and thriving. Additionally, the reduction of chlorides to the environment will have impacts on many Minnesota waterways that are downstream of the Pomme de Terre River, including the Minnesota River and Mississippi River.

Project Rationale

This project is being required by the MPCA to meet discharge limits. The current water treatment facility is approximately 40 years old. While the City's NPDES permit and replacing old infrastructure are two of the driving factors for the project, another significant aspect of this facility is the regional impact it will have on the area. The proposed facility will provide a softened water supply for the University of MN Morris. The new facility will also provide softened water to the regional ethanol plant DENCO II, allowing them to decrease their water usage and meet their NPDES discharge limits for wastewater and avoid the danger of shutting down the facility for noncompliance.

The new facility will help Morris meet its chloride discharge requirements reducing waste being discharged to the Pomme de Terre River. This environmental protection project will also have impacts everywhere downstream of Morris.

Other Considerations

a. Maintaining area jobs (possibly job creation).

b. Environmental protection.

c. NPDES Permit compliance (MPCA requirement).

d. Regional drinking water protection/impact.

e. Replacement of aging infrastructure in the State.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional State operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

City of Morris

Who will operate the facility?

City of Morris

Who will use or occupy this space?

No private entities will occupy or use this facility.

Public Purpose

The City of Morris new regional water treatment facility will serve area residents, businesses and institutions. The new facility will be a lime/soda ash water treatment facility to comply with the Minnesota Pollution Control Agencies NPDES Permit for discharge of chlorides to the Pomme de Terre River, having a significant positive impact on the environment.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Blaine C. Hill
City Manager
320-589-3141
bhill@ci.morris.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Morris Water Treatment Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$5,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$12,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$12,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$12,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Morrison County — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Soo Line Trail - Bridge Pier Restoration Project	1	GO	$ 400	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 400	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 400	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Soo Line Trail - Bridge Pier Restoration Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$400
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Soo Line Trail - Bridge 49553 over Mississippi River - concrete pier restoration

Project Description

The substructures are all deficient, in poor condition and in need of repair. All four piers require concrete rehabilitation of the caps and footings to return them to their original service condition. This would be considered Phase 1 of the larger plan to fully refurbish the trail bridge. Phase 1 project cost is estimated at $400,000.

Both concrete abutments require significant repairs to bring them back to their original service condition. This would be considered Phase 2 of the larger plan to fully refurnish the trail bridge. Phase 2 project cost is estimated at $550,000.

Project Rationale

Bridge 49553 was built in 1908 as a railroad bridge and repurposed in 2006 for public trail use. The bridge includes two tall reinforced concrete abutments and four tall piers, and all six substructures exhibit deterioration and are in need of repair. This is proposed as two (2) phase project, where the concrete piers will be repaired as part of phase 1 and the concrete abutments will be repaired as part of phase 2. The National Bridge Inventory (NBI) Condition Code for the substructure is at 4 - poor condition, for extensive cracking, spalling and delamination, coupled with significant movement of the abutments.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The cost to repair ($400,000) would be less burden on the operating budget versus the cost to replace the bridge ($2,300,000).

Who will own the facility?

Morrison County

Who will operate the facility?

Morrison County

Who will use or occupy this space?

Regional Public Trail

Public Purpose

Regional Public Trail

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Steve Backowski
County Engineer
320-632-0120
steveb@co.morrison.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Soo Line Trail - Bridge Pier Restoration Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$400	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$400**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$60	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$340	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$400**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Newport, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Newport I & I - Sanitary Service Lining and Manhole Seal	1	GO	$ 1,162	$ 0	$ 0
Newport I & I - Sanitary Mainline-Service Lining and Manhole Seal	2	GO	$ 3,512	$ 0	$ 0
Maxwell Avenue Property Acquisition	3	GO	$ 215	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,889	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,889	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Newport I&I - Sanitary Service Lining and Manhole Seal

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,162
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The City of Newport is requesting funding to install a cured in-place liner from the sewer main within the service line toward the residence to a cleanout installed in the boulevard for approximately 200 residential services. Ancillary improvements will include chemical grouting and sealing of the 75 sanitary manholes within the project area and boulevard restoration.

Project Description

Project Rationale

The City of Newport has recently completed (2012) a sewer main-line lining project in this area in an effort to reduce the infiltration and inflow (I&I) into the sanitary sewer system. The City lined approximately 16,500 feet of sanitary mainline pipe servicing the 200+ residence noted above. The City has since observed significant I&I entering the mainline at the location of these service lines. During the torrential rains in the Metro Area in June of 2014, the City's wastewater flow increased over 10 times more than the average and the City was levied a surcharge of over $800,000 by the Metropolitan Council for excessive wastewater peak discharge. The City has identified the proposed project area as the worst location in this system for I&I and is requesting funding to help reduce the cost of these improvements.

Other Considerations

The City currently has a very low net taxing capacity due to a per capita levy of over $700 in addition to an annual sewer rate of $300 for the average City resident.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The residents of the City of Newport own and maintain their sewer service line from the residence to the sewer main.

Who will operate the facility?

The residents of the City of Newport own and maintain their sewer service line from the residence to the sewer main.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Residents of the City of Newport

Public Purpose

Reduce operation/maintenance costs for the City Public Works Department and protect the City against future Met Council surcharges.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Debora Hill
City Administrator
651-459-5677
dhill@newportmn.com

($ in thousands)

Newport I & I - Sanitary Service Lining and Manhole Seal

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,162	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
General Fund Cash	$625	$538	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$625**	**$1,700**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$82	$117	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$78	$0	$0
Construction	$543	$1,455	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$108	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$625**	**$1,758**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Newport I&I - Sanitary Mainline-Service Lining and Manhole Seal

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,512
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	The City of Newport is requesting funding to install a cured in-place liner in the sanitary sewer main line and service connections in areas of the City sewer system susceptible to infiltration and inflow (I&I). The lining will be applied to approximately 10 miles of deteriorating vitrified clay pipe throughout the City. Included in this project will be the installation of service liners extending from the mainline toward the home with a cleanout installed in the boulevard. Ancillary improvements will include chemical grouting and sealing of the 220 sanitary manholes within the project area and boulevard restoration.

Project Description

Project Rationale

The City has since observed significant I&I entering the mainline within the project area. During the torrential rains in the Metro Area in June of 2014, the City's wastewater flow increased over 10 times more than the average and the City was levied a surcharge of over $800,000 by the Metropolitan Council for excessive wastewater peak discharge. The City has identified the proposed project area as the worst location in this system for I&I and is requesting funding to help defray the cost of these improvements.

Other Considerations

The City currently has a very low net taxing capacity due to a per capita levy of over $700 in addition to an annual sewer rate of $300 for the average City resident.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of Newport will own and operate the mainline sewer system. The residents of the City of Newport own and maintain their sewer service line from the residence to the sewer main.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Newport will own and operate the mainline sewer system. The residents of the City of Newport own and maintain their sewer service line from the residence to the sewer main.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Residents of the City of Newport

Public Purpose

Reduce operation/maintenance costs for the City Public Works Department and protect the City against future Met Council surcharges.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Debora Hill
City Administrator
651-459-5677
dhill@newportmn.com

($ in thousands)

Newport I & I - Sanitary Mainline-Service Lining and Manhole Seal

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,512	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
General Fund Cash	$0	$3,512	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,024**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$780	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,724	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$790	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,294**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Maxwell Avenue Property Acquisition

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$215
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	The City of Newport is requesting funds for the acquisition of a parcel owned by MNDOT which is located at the intersection of Maxwell Avenue and I-494. The City has an agreement with MNDOT to purchase the property for purposes of economic development – MNDOT does not have any future use for the parcel. The site has a great location due to it having great visibility and excellent access to I-494 and Highway 61/10. It is also located across the street from the new Transit Station. $215,000 of state funding is requested to match the same amount of funding from the City of Newport.

Project Description

The site is 2.97 acres of vacant land that is 100% encumbered by a MNDOT easement for highway purposes. The parcel reflects excess right of way no longer needed by MNDOT. An appraisal valued the underlying fee ownership interest and easement interest at $430,000. The parcel is currently zoned I-1 – light industrial. The City would use EDA funds for the acquisition match.

Project Rationale

- After the new construction of the Wacouta Bridge and Highway 61/10, Newport lost about 10% of its tax base. The City is nearly fully built out and quality buildable sites for economic development and recapturing tax base are few.
- Because MNDOT has no future plans for the site, the City would like to see the land return back to the tax rolls.
- The location lends itself to be very marketable with visibility, access to major highways, and being in the immediate proximity of the new bus transit site.

Other Considerations

The City of Newport has been working with Washington County HRA to market and develop the new bus transit site.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Newport

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Newport

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Debora Hill
City Administrator
651-459-5677
dhill@newportmn.com

($ in thousands)

Maxwell Avenue Property Acquisition

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$215	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
General Fund Cash	$0	$215	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$430**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$430	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$430**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Dyslexia Institute of Minnesota Diagnostic and Teaching Facility	1	GO	$ 1,500	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 1,500	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 1,500	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Dyslexia Institute of Minnesota Diagnostic and Teaching Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Public costs can be reduced by treating dyslexia effectively. The Dyslexia Institute of Minnesota serves students and adults throughout the entire state. $1.5 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, predesign, design and construct a replacement building for Olmsted County to support the local, regional and national literacy work of the Dyslexia Institute of MN, located in Rochester, MN.

Project Description

The project is to support the mission of the Dyslexia Institute of MN to meet the needs of people affected by dyslexia.

The project includes land acquisition, predesign/design, construction and technology for a replacement facility that will include nine tutoring spaces, a large, dividable training space to accommodate up to 60 trainees, a space for Reading Readiness classes for children aged four to six, four practicum spaces for small group training, and two smaller classrooms for school-aged classes.

Project Rationale

Dyslexia is a neurological condition that directly interferes with an individual's ability to learn the pivotal task of reading, often leading to increased societal costs for Public Safety, Social Services and Education.

Dyslexia is a common condition, affecting 1 out of 5 people, but relatively few people with dyslexia are diagnosed and receive appropriate help that can enable them to achieve their full potential. Evidence shows that struggling readers who do not receive appropriate intervention start failing early. Dyslexia is highly correlated with poverty and its many related social costs.

Dyslexia has an educational solution. The Dyslexia Institute of MN has been meeting the needs of people with dyslexia for 65 years, training 1,700 adults and educators and helping 8,700 students improve their reading ability.

In order to meet the growing demand and need for evidence-based solutions to literacy problems caused by dyslexia, the Dyslexia Institute of MN, with the partnership of Olmsted County, will build a professional, technologically updated building that will house programming that changes the lives of students with dyslexia, trains educators in the proven Orton-Gillingham approach and provides effective outreach education to the community in order to identify dyslexia early.

Other Considerations

The Dyslexia Institute of MN, dba The Reading Center (TRC), has a long and revered history of turning around the lives of young people with dyslexia by teaching them to read, write and spell, and by offering world-class Orton Gillingham (OG) training to adults who seek to teach students with dyslexia. Long trusted as a reputable source of treatment for dyslexia by professionals throughout the region, including Mayo Clinic, the Dyslexia Institute of MN is one of only two accredited centers of Orton Gillingham training and tutoring west of the Mississippi. Currently, the majority of services of the Dyslexia Institute of MN must be offered offsite in spaces all over the county that are rented and borrowed; the inefficiencies of the situation have stunted the growth of this rare, in-demand service. In addition to serving clientele and trainees of the nonprofit, TRC is a key partner in the Rochester Reading Champions collaboration, providing free OG tutoring onsite to at-risk, under-served young people at the Boys & Girls Club of Rochester, Olmsted County Adult Detention, MN Adult and Teen Challenge, and Hawthorne Continuing Education.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars are requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

Olmsted County

Who will operate the facility?

Dyslexia Institute of MN

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Dyslexia Institute of MN, dba The Reading Center (TRC), has been teaching children and adults with dyslexia to read for 65 years, since 1951. Operating out of Rochester, MN, TRC has helped over 8,700 students and trained over 1,700 adults in the scientifically validated Orton Gillingham (OG) approach to teach the skill of reading. Students and trainees come for services and trainings from the region, the state and the nation. As one of only two centers accredited west of the Mississippi for providing OG reading instruction and training, this MN resource is rare and in demand. A nonprofit organization, TRC is the only source of scholarships for OG tutoring, testing and treatment in MN, last year providing $58,000 in services for students from MN. For the past 8 years, TRC provided virtually free OG training for Rochester District teachers, customized for classroom teachers, and expanded the training to the Byron and St. James School Districts. In 2014, TRC provided 169 students with intensive, 1:1 OG tutoring (20% of which was provided online to students at a distance), tested 95 students in order to identify the source of their reading struggle, trained 99 educators and other adults in OG, provided 86 free Reading Readiness screenings to 4 – 6 year olds, and provided free, outreach education about dyslexia to 1,796 adults. The current building, owned by TRC since 2002, was built in 1969 and was originally operated as an auto repair shop. The current facility is extremely undersized, with 3 offices, a conference room and three tutoring/testing rooms. Current staff utilize space in the library and stairwell out of necessity. Most tutoring, classes and training occurs in rented and borrowed spaces scattered throughout Olmsted County. When remodeled for TRC, air ducts were overlooked for some tutoring rooms and offices, making them cold in the winter and hot in the summer. There are only 3 parking spots located on

TRC property.

Public Purpose

Dyslexia mitigation serves the public purpose of reducing educational, social service, and public safety costs as well as increasing the earning potential of affected individuals. One in five individuals have dyslexia spectrum related reading difficulties. On a single day in August of 2013, Olmsted County Adult Detention gave their inmates a dyslexia screening tool. Forty-six percent (46%) of inmates were likely dyslexic. Statistics from the National Institute of Health report that: • 85% of all juveniles who interface with the court system are functionally illiterate • 63% of prison inmates can't read; 70% read under a 4th grade level The Department of Justice states the link between academic failure and delinquency, violence and crime is welded to reading failure. Treating dyslexia will effectively reduce publicly-borne costs well in excess of the cost of treatment.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Laura Blatti--primary contact. Please also see Attachment A for additional information.
Olmsted County Administrative Coordinator
507-328-6012
blatti.laura@co.olmsted.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Dyslexia Institute of Minnesota Diagnostic and Teaching Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$400	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$1,436	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,336**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$500	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$201	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,300	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$371	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,372**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

Oronoco, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Oronoco Wastewater Collection and Treatment facilities	1	GO	$ 18,996	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 18,996	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 18,996	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Oronoco Wastewater Collection and Treatment facilities

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$18,996
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	~$19 million in state funds is requested to acquire land, design, and construct a wastewater collection and treatment sewer system to serve the City of Oronoco.

Project Description

Oronoco's proposed wastewater system improvements are comprised of a wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) and sanitary sewer collection and conveyance infrastructure. The proposed wastewater system is discussed in detail within a draft Wastewater Facilities Plan prepared by Stantec for the City of Oronoco in April 2014 with amendments discussed herein.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities Scope:

The proposed municipal WWTF would be located in Oronoco and is intended to serve residents and businesses within the City Limits. The WWTF would initially be sized for a 0.38 MGD AWW flow that is projected to serve the Oronoco's wastewater treatment needs over the next 20 years. The mechanical WWTF would employ a variety of equipment and unit processes to produce an effluent capable of meeting discharge limits into the Middle Fork of the Zumbro River.

Sanitary Sewer Collection and Conveyance Infrastructure Scope:

Oronoco's rolling topography, diverse geology and river systems in combination with the existing Trunk Highway 52 facilities and sprawling residential development make the development and implementation of an efficient sanitary sewer collection and conveyance system a significant challenge. In light of these challenges and constrains, a proposed sanitary sewer collection and conveyance system was developed that strives to provide sanitary sewer service to Oronoco's existing and developing properties over the next twenty years and beyond. The proposed sanitary sewer collection system includes a combination of gravity collection, low pressure system collection and centralized lift stations to convey wastewater out of low lying areas via force main to the proposed WWTF.

The preliminary design layout of the proposed sanitary collection and conveyance system is shown on Figures 1-North and 1-South attached to this application. Within these figures, each of Oronoco's 16 sanitary sewer districts are outlined in black and project phasing is color coded per the figure legend. Proposed sanitary sewer collection system improvements are illustrated with different colored line types as indicated in the figure legend. The proposed sanitary sewer collection system (which Oronoco is requesting Bonding Funds) would initially service ~ 419 properties located in Sewer Districts B, C, F, G, J, K and would be expanded to serve sewer service of Districts L and M in 2025. Note that existing development agreements associated with Districts L and M prohibit connection to a municipal collection system until 2025 and that the costs to connect these areas with the proposed sanitary sewer collection system would be borne completely by the property owners and City. Sewer Districts A, D, E and H would be completed at the request of the property owners in

theses area but, is not anticipated for 20 plus years as these areas are predominantly served by compliant SSTS with ample property to facilitate SSTS replacement, if needed. Sewer Districts I, O, P and N would be served as development occurs and with sewer collection and conveyance primarily at the cost to the property developers.

Related Water System Improvements Scope (Excluded from Bonding Funding Request):

Oronoco currently has a municipal water supply and distribution system that serves about 2/3 of the community. Oronoco is planning to expand the water system to serve properties in sewer districts C and F in conjunction with the proposed sanitary sewer collection system improvements. The rationale being that there is a documented need to serve these areas with water and it would be most efficient and cost effective to construct both sewer and water facilities at one time. In addition to the aforementioned water distribution improvements, Oronoco is also planning to extend the proposed trunk watermain within sewer district C, southward to connect with the existing trunk watermain located in sewer district K. This watermain loop is necessary to prevent water stagnation issues within sewer district C, provide adequate fire protection and enhance system reliability. Finally, Oronoco is tentatively planning to add a second well to the water supply system. A second well is needed to enhance water supply reliability in case there are mechanical issues with Oronoco's sole well. Oronoco is NOT requesting any Mn Bonding Funding assistance for the aforementioned water system improvements with an estimated project cost of $3,123,384 as we do not wish to complicate our application or detract from our primary goal of constructing a municipal wastewater system.

Wastewater Project Costs and Funding

The total estimated project costs for Oronoco's Wastewater System totals $23,091,000 and would be constructed in 2017, 2018 and 2019. Existing agency wastewater infrastructure funding programs administered by the Public Facilities Authority (PFA) and USDA Rural Development (RD) are structured to finance the rehabilitation of existing wastewater infrastructure or construct SSTS for small communities with minimal growth potential. Unfortunately, Oronoco does not fit into this mold. Oronoco is starting from the beginning and does not have the existing municipal wastewater system needed to serve its growing population. Oronoco can and has qualified for a low interest loan through PFA's Clean Water Revolving Fund (CWRF) that could be used to fund the proposed wastewater system, but cannot afford to make the payments on a project of this size and scope. If no bonding assistance is secure to fund this project, the estimated cost to serve the initial 419 properties would be $55,110 per parcel.

Oronoco's overall median income is too high to qualify for significant grant funding. However, the downtown area of Oronoco (Sewer District B & F) were surveyed in 2008 and at that time reported median income of $42,500. This is also the area with the greatest need for a Wastewater System. Oronoco may qualify for Point Source Implementation Grant (PSIG); however, grant funding is capped at a maximum of $3 million.

The only way Oronoco can afford a wastewater system is through a combination of Mn Bonding funds, PSIG / PFA administered grant and loans and local cost share. Local cost share would be comprised of assessments / connection charges, user fees and local tax revenue. The following text summarizes the project cost share by element.

Total Estimated Project costs (Wastewater Collection and Treatment - $23,091,000) + (Water Supply and Distribution Improvements - $3,123,384) yields a combined total project cost of $26,214,384. Oronoco's anticipated local share for these improvements, paid through assessments, connection charges, utility rates and city taxes would be (Wastewater Collection and Treatment -

$2,095,000) + (Water Supply and Distribution Improvements - $3,123,384) which yields a combined total local project cost share of $5,218,384 or 19.9% of the project costs. It is important to note that Oronoco is not requesting bonding assistance for the proposed Water Supply and Distribution Improvements however, these cost should be considered part of the total Project Costs and included in the percent of local share cost calculation as the sewer and water infrastructure are somewhat interdependent. It should also be noted that Oronoco anticipates that the project will qualify for approximately $2,000,000 in grant funding through PFA Wastewater / PSIG (Point Source Implementation Grant). These grant funds are not guaranteed and if Oronoco does not qualify for the anticipated grant funds, the City and its residents will be required to fund the difference.

Project Rationale

Currently, the City of Oronoco is the largest un-sewered community in the State of Minnesota. Oronoco's 2014 population is currently 1,405 and is located ~5 miles north of Rochester on TH 52.

In 2013, the City completed a Community Assessment Report (CAR) that evaluated the private wastewater treatment systems in downtown Oronoco, north of the Zumbro River. This report determined that more than 75% of the systems in the study area are either not compliant with current Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) standards, or were at the end of their expected service life. We believe that of all of the older SSTS in Oronoco are in similar condition to the CAR study area.

The majority of the properties with non-compliant Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) do not have cost effective options to replace their existing systems due to the presents of bedrock, high groundwater, soil conditions, proximity to the floodplain, size of their lot and setback requirements. Moreover, residents with non-compliant systems cannot easily sell their properties as financial institutions are reluctant to finance mortgages for properties without compliant SSTS.

In 2015, the MPCA, Olmsted County and the City of Oronoco executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will expire in 2020. Under the terms of the MOU, non-compliant SSTS in the older parts of Oronoco will be exempt from new County / MPCA requirements and associated enforcement action but, must be brought in to compliance or connected to a municipal wastewater system by 2020. Failure to meet this requirement would be a significant setback for the City and a hardship for its residents. The following paragraphs discuss the SSTS Ordinance and MOU requirements in greater detail.

Olmsted County recently update their Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) Ordinance in an effort to comply with recent revisions to state regulations, Chapters 7080 to 7083. The new state and county SSTS regulation are a great source of concern to the City of Oronoco and its residents. If existing, non-compliant SSTS are required to comply with the SSTS Ordinance requirements in order to sell or upgrade their properties, the investment in these SSTS will undermine support for the proposed municipal wastewater collection and treatment system. This would result in prolonging our struggle to serve Oronoco residents with wastewater collection and treatment at a cost that would be significantly greater than what is currently proposed.

In recognition of this concern, the MPCA, Olmsted County and the City of Oronoco executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to address the aforementioned concerns. The MOU states that the properties located within Sewer District B, C or F will have a separate set of standards for SSTS for the five year period starting on the effective date of the MOU. The standards are based on the understanding that this area will ultimately be served by a municipal wastewater collection and treatment system. The MOU applies to SSTS that are failing to protect groundwater or pose an

imminent threat to public health and safety (ITPH). ITPH is discharge of wastewater to the surface or building and failure to protect groundwater is a system that is not compliant with MR 7080.1500. Subp. 4.B (SSTS without the minimum vertical separation requirement, pit, not properly abandoned).

Oronoco is located in an "Active Karst" geologic area which is underlain by carbonate bedrock with less than 50 feet of sediment cover. Oronoco's karst geology in combination with its proximity to the Zumbro River make protecting both ground and surface waters a priority. The elimination of hundreds of noncompliant SSTS systems in Oronoco would be a significant step towards protecting both resources. To that end, the Olmsted County Water Management Plan (2013-2023) supports the development of a Municipal Wastewater System in Oronoco.

Oronoco is poised for significant growth if a municipal wastewater system can be constructed. Facts that support this assertion are summarized as follows:

- Located ~ 5 miles north of Rochester on TH 52.
- The Mayo Clinic's DMC initiative is underway and beginning to create demand for housing and spurring commercial and economic growth within the region.
- Recently constructed TH 52 infrastructure including interchanges, an overpass and frontage road provide safe, efficient, and effective access to Oronoco.
- Oronoco is located at the confluence of the Middle Fork and South Branch of the Zumbro River. Nestled in the bluffs of the Zumbro River Valley, Oronoco has an abundance of natural beauty and outdoor recreational opportunities for prospective residents.
- The undeveloped land between Oronoco's southern Ultimate Service Area boundary and existing development will support a combination of residential and commercial development totaling ~ 7,300 Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs).
- There is a need to support smart growth, a mix of higher and lower density residential growth in combination with commercial development. Without a municipal wastewater system, higher density and commercial growth are not possible.

Other Considerations

The following facts further reinforce Oronoco's need for the proposed wastewater system and the necessity of Bonding funding assistance to move the project forward.

1. Oronoco has been planning for and investing in a future municipal wastewater system for some time. Oronoco's Interim Residential Subdivision Ordinance was developed and implemented in ~2002. Development under this Ordinance requires that the developer construct a municipal-type wastewater collection and potable water distribution system. Wastewater treatment was then provided by a Community Waste Treatment System (CWTS) and potable water was supplied by a community well. Both systems were intended to ultimately be incorporated into a traditional municipal water supply and sewer collection and treatment systems with the CWTS's being abandoned in place and redeveloped as parkland or residential housing.

The construction of the municipal wastewater collection systems for development under the Interim Residential Subdivision Ordinance required a significant investment by the City of Oronoco and its residents. The result of this investment is that cost to serve these subdivisions is significantly less than the cost would be if the wastewater collection systems had not been constructed.

Currently there are three commercial developments (~13 lots) and three residential developments (~225 Lots) that have been developed under this ordinance. The water supply and distribution systems have been incorporated into the City's Water system. The abandonment of the existing

CWTS's and conveyance of the associated wastewater can be completed efficiently and will also facilitate serving future development. In addition, serving these parcels is advantageous as it brings a significant number of users to the proposed wastewater utility to help pay for the infrastructure improvements and operation and maintenance costs.

A summary of investments associated with the development of a municipal Wastewater system over the past 12 years are include:

- $65,000 for the preparation of the 2014 Facility Plan Cost
- $9,360 for Sewer and Water Committee Meetings – Engineering Services (2010 to 2015)
- $20,000 for construction of TH 52 casings and small diameter force main pipe
- $1,785,000 for construction of Wastewater collection system serving ~ 238 Residential and Commercial Lots developed under the Interim Subdivision Ordinance.

The total cost of these recent investments in wastewater infrastructure total $1,879,360 or 7.2% of the $26,214,384 combined Wastewater and Drinking Water system estimated project costs. This cost share does not show up in the CBS system calculations but, are an important consideration.

1. Serving Oronoco with a municipal wastewater system is complicated by some existing topographic, geologic and transportation infrastructure constraints. These challenges and constraints are summarized as follows:

- Oronoco is situated in Olmsted County, approximately 5 miles north of the City of Rochester and currently encompasses approximately 1,330 developed acres.
- Oronoco's Ultimate Service Area, which includes Oronoco's current City Limits plus an additional 2,400 acres is located primarily to the south of the current City Limits.
- U.S. Highway 52 bi-sects Oronoco in a north-south direction
- The Middle Fork and South Branch of the Zumbro River generally flow west to east and merge in the center of Oronoco.
- Present-day Oronoco includes the original historic downtown area containing primarily smaller residential lots, residential lots developed along the former Lake Shady lakebed and more recent residential development consisting of larger lots, many of which were developed under Oronoco's Interim Residential Subdivision Ordinance.
- Terrain is rolling with small bluffs, high bedrock and karst geology.

1. Oronoco's 2014 LGA payment was $70,114. The Average 2014 LGA funding for Cities with populations within ~ 200 population of Oronoco (pop. 1406) was $395,510.84. This is 82.3% less LGA funding than other, similarly sized Cities MN. If Oronoco received an additional $325,396.84 in LGA to match the average LGA payment for similarly sized Cities, this funding would make a principal and interest payment on a 20 year PFA loan at 1% interest with a lone amount totaling $7,226,306. See attachments to Oronoco CBS for additional documentation on this topic.

2. Over the course of the past six years, MnDOT and Olmsted County have "Turned Back" 5 bridges and 6.52 miles of roadway to the City of Oronoco to operate and maintain. Oronoco had no authority to reject the turn backs under state law. The estimated cost to operate and maintain these facilities over the next 25 years totals nearly $2.1 million or $95,888 per year. The estimate is based on 2015 construction costs and excludes inflation. The 6.52 miles of turnback roadway

increased Oronoco's total length of two lane roadway by 30.7% to 21.25 miles. See attachments to Oronoco CBS for additional documentation on this topic.

3. Oronoco has a modest commercial / industrial tax base. The lack of a wastewater system inhibits Oronoco's ability to attract commercial / industrial development.
4. Oronoco is burdened with existing debit service to pay for the first phase of a ~ $2.8M City water supply and distribution system constructed in 2009 & 2010.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Oronoco

Who will operate the facility?

Oronoco

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Oronoco's proposed wastewater system will serve current and future residents and business owners with an effective means of collecting, treating and discharging wastewater in a manner that meets or exceeds MPCA and EPA requirements while protecting existing groundwater sources from wastewater contamination.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Sandy Jessen
Clerk / Treasurer
507-367-4405
oronococity@gmail.com

($ in thousands)

Oronoco Wastewater Collection and Treatment facilities

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$18,996	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$2,095	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$23,091**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$245	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$150	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,580	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$310	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$15,709	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$25	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$4,072	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$23,091**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Otter Tail County — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Perham to Pelican Rapids Recreational Trail	1	GO	$ 4,335	$ 4,336	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,335	$ 4,336	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,335	$ 4,336	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Perham to Pelican Rapids Recreational Trail

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,335
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This 27-mile, 10-foot wide, multi-use paved trail would connect Perham and Pelican Rapids, and (very importantly) run through Maplewood State Park enroute. Would use public rights of way, which has rolling topography and numerous lakes and wetands.

Project Description

Three major partners have been involved in planning, and funding the $66,363 Master Plan authored by SRF, Otter Tail County and the Cities of Perham and Pelican Rapids. Other planning partners included Maplewood State Park, MnDOT, DNR, West Central Initiative, Partnership4Health and the Otter Tail County Tourism Association. This Master Plan can be found at http://www.co.otter-tail.mn.us/DocumentCenter/Home/View/2957 . This plan divides the 27-mile trail into 4 legs consisting of 6.83, 8.11, 5.83 and 6.41 miles. The route has 25 named lakes on or nearby, in addition to wetlands. The lakes not only add to the draw for destination users, but also also means that numerous locals live within a short distance of the trail.

Project Rationale

Otter Tail County has more lakes than any Minnesota county, with over 1,000 lakes, and 25 named lakes on or within a mile of this route. Despite this, the county has limited access to state trails, the only example being Central Lakes Trail on the SW corner of the county at Fergus Falls. This trail would serve several purposes:

1) Tourism draw, which would be beneficial for the resorts within the route's zone of influence, in addition to the well-established commercial tourism infrastructure that both Perham and Pelican Rapids have in place. Winter snowmobiling on this trail will accentuate the tourism draw.

2) Economic Development is a direct tourism offshoot. An 11-state analysis performed in 2011 by Garrett and Peltier showed that for every $1 million spent on pedestrian and cycling projects, 11.4 jobs are created within the state. The existing tourism infrastructure will experience the impact of this 27-mile multi-use trail, which will also include winter snowmobiling.

3) Enhancement for local citizens for general biking and/or day-tripping to-and-from various lakes, or Maplewood State Park. Note that the Lakes Area Bike Club is a well-established biking group consisting of members from throughout west central Minnesota. They hold a ride ever Tuesday of the biking season, and would be substantial users of this trail. http://lakesareabikeclub.com/index.cfm

4) Transportation route for lake and rural residents to get to Perham or Pelican Rapids, both of which have vigorous job centers. Pelican has approximately 1,500 jobs in town, and Perham approximately 4,400.

Other Considerations

Otter Tail County has over 1,000 lakes, and a well-established tourism infrastructure. Despite that fact, it only has one leg of state recreational trail, a 21-mile leg of Central Lakes Trail in the SW corner of the county. This proposed 27-mile trail will run through the heart of the county, and will be on/near 25 named lakes. Significantly, future plans call for a 21-mile leg to connect to Central Lakes and a 13-mile leg to Heartland Trail, which is already connected to Paul Bunyan Trail. These interconnects would create a 275-mile system encompassing a significant portion of central and western Minnesota.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Otter Tail County will have to adjust our Public Works budget to reflect the operational costs required on this trail. We anticipate that the first 15 years of operational costs will consist of routine maintenance.

Who will own the facility?

Otter Tail County

Who will operate the facility?

Otter Tail County

Who will use or occupy this space?

NA

Public Purpose

Multi-purpose trail will have full public accessibility, including handicap usage. Perham and Pelican Rapids both have significant tourism infrastructure, and destination trail users will help stimulate these businesses.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous trail appropriations

Project Contact Person

Rick West
County Highway Engineer
218-998-8473
rwest@co.otter-tail.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Perham to Pelican Rapids Recreational Trail

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$4,335	$4,336	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$4,335	$4,336	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,670**	**$8,672**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$50	$50	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$168	$166	$0
Design Fees	$0	$800	$806	$0
Project Management	$0	$111	$111	$0
Construction	$0	$6,012	$6,010	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,529	$1,529	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,670**	**$8,672**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

Pennington County

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Pennington County Law Enforcement & Justice Center	1	GO	$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 15,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Pennington County Law Enforcement & Justice Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$15,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$15,000,000 in state funds is requested for predesign, design, construct, furnish and equip a new building for Pennington County Law Enforcement and Judicial Center to be located in Thief River Falls, MN.

Project Description

The new justice center will provide operational space for all justice services such as County sheriff, City police, County attorney, Minnesota district 9 court services, state probation services and county jail. The facility will include 28,370 square feet new justice space, 12,940 square feet new efficient modular design jail, 6,400 square feet of remodeled jail space.

The proposed schedule would be to complete design and construction documents and be prepared to issue the project for bids in spring of 2016 with construction to be completed the beginning of 2018. Estimated construction cost is $13,196,550 and with soft cost the total project is estimated at $15,000,000.

Project Rationale

Built in 1976 the existing Pennington County Jail and Law Enforcement facility, is functionally obsolete and inadequately sized and configured for appropriate current and future programming and operations. Several moderate and small remodeling projects have been completed in attempt to extend the service life of the jail. In 1999 the building next to the med/max facility was converted into a minimum security annex. Dividing staff between two buildings does not provide optimal security or back-up. The linear design of the original jail further hinders supervision.

Pennington County's justice operations lack security and safety for staff, public and inmates. The scope of the addition and remodeling to the existing law enforcement center and jail is to correct these deficiencies. Current conditions require that inmates be escorted out of the jail across a main city street into public corridors in the courthouse. This places staff, the inmates and public in danger of conflict and retaliation. The new justice center will provide direct secure inmate access to the courts while maintaining secure separation of public, staff and inmate movement.

Pennington County's correctional system is a source of opportunity and rehabilitation to the inmates of Pennington County as well as neighboring counties and state inmates. Of the county's inmate population approximately 30% are afforded the opportunity to provide services to the community while gaining trade skills. Sentence to Serve or STS as it's called provides services to seniors and general community needs, by providing a variety of services such as maintenance, lawn care and construction. The STS crews are led and managed by a service leader to provide support, direction and a training experience. The new justice center will provide increase capacity to allow for expansion of these programs for the state and regional counties.

Other Considerations

Pennington County has been studying the building of a new law enforcement center for some time. Renovation of the current facility and construction of additional structure are the best use of space and will provide safety to the inmates as well as the officers and general public. Separation of inmates for investigative or safety concerns is limited with our present design. Thief River Falls is a growing population and the design being proposed would accommodate future growth. Because of the growing number of mentally ill that are incarcerated, the addition of observation and direct-supervision cells, would be a great benefit.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

If the County were forced to bond for the entire cost of a new

Who will own the facility?

Pennington County

Who will operate the facility?

Pennington County

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

The new facility will provide a safe and secure facility for inmate incarceration according to the standards established by the Minnesota Department of Corrections. A second equally important purpose is to increase safety to the general public by not transporting inmates across the street for court appearances. Maintaining security outside the facility is very difficult. Deputies must transport prisoners across the street for court appearances which exposes the prisoner and officers to family, friends, and victims. The design for a new facility would eliminate this and eliminate the potential introduction of contraband into the jail.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Darryl Tveitbakk
Chair
218-683-7000
caanderson@co.pennington.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Pennington County Law Enforcement & Justice Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$15,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$15,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$20	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$950	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$300	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$11,036	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$200	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$1,080	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,414	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$15,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Pipestone, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
New Water Treatment Facility and Well	1	GO	$ 6,647	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 6,647	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 6,647	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

New Water Treatment Facility and Well

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,647
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$6.647 million in state funds is requested to plan, design and construct a new water treatment facility to remove radium and gross alpha along with total dissolved solids, chlorides and specific conductance as required by our wastewater NPDES permit along with design and construction of a new well at the water treatment facility site.

Project Description

This project includes planning, design and construction of a new lime/soda ash softening treatment plant and design and construction of a new well at the new water treatment plant site. Watermain connections from remote wells No. 4 and 5 to the treatment facility are also included. The project will provide treatment of radium and gross alpha, both of which are currently being blended for compliance by the City. The project will also provide ability of the City's wastewater plant to meet new wastewater limits and protect the water for downstream surface water users.

The treated water would be stored in a clearwell prior to pumping to the distribution system. A backwash reclaim tank would also be provided to reclaim the settled washwater through the filtration process. Chemical feed processes, including chlorination, fluoridation and corrosion inhibitors would also be included. The lime/soda ash sludge would be stored in a lagoon and periodically land applied.

The softening process would remove the radium and gross alpha to comply with the MCL for these parameters. The removal of hardness as lime sludge would also result in lower TDS, specific conductance and hardness. These reductions would provide compliance with the NPDES limits of the WWTP.

Wells No. 1 and 2 would be connected to the treatment facility. Well No. 4 requires approximately 1.5 miles of watermain to connect to the facility. Well No. 5 would also be piped a similar distance. The routing of the watermain would be in various right of ways to reduce disturbance to any finished roadways. An additional well is proposed at the new WTP site to provide long-term firm capacity. The current wells do not have capacity to meet the future firm capacity needs.

The project will be constructed with green components including the reuse of filter backwash water, LED lights, variable speed motors and premium efficiency electric motors. Additionally, the project is being constructed to meet EPA water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life and also to protect downstream surface water users.

The City has submitted a request to the Minnesota Department of Health, Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund Program to be placed on the Project Priority List (PPL) and the 2016 Intended Use Plan. The City has been selected for a $3 million Point Source Implementation Grant through the Minnesota Public Facilities Authority.

Project Rationale

No water treatment is provided other than chlorine and fluoride addition. The radiochemical testing has detected levels of gross alpha and radium levels that exceed the primary maximum contaminant level (MCL) set by the Safe Drinking Water Act. Wells No. 1 and 5 exceed the gross alpha limit. Well No. 4 exceeds the radium limit. Well No. 2 does not exceed either limit but is near 80% of the MCL. The system is currently blending to meet limits but is limited in how it can blend.

The City's well water is generally hard and has high levels of total dissolved solids (TDS). The City's wastewater system has recently received a compliance schedule for chlorides, TDS, and specific conductance. The chlorides are a result of home softeners treating the naturally hard water. Even without the contribution from home softeners, the TDS and specific conductance concentrations may not be met with the City's well water without further treatment. It is not technically or financially feasible to treat this at the WWTP. Therefore treatment at the WTP will be required.

Wells: The existing wells have the capacity to meet the peak demands with the largest well out of service. Wells No. 4 and 5 are remote wells. Wells No. 1 and 2 are located adjacent to the current storage tank and booster pumps. The radium and gross alpha issues in these wells was discussed above. The remote location makes treatment of Wells No. 4 an 5 difficult.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Annual operation costs will be budgeted and paid for by the City of Pipestone.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Pipestone will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Water/Wastewater staff for the City of Pipestone will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The City of Pipestone Water/Wastewater Department.

Public Purpose

Community drinking water treatment.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Deb Nelson
Assistant to the CIty Administrator
507-825-3324
dnelson@cityofpipestone.com

($ in thousands)

New Water Treatment Facility and Well

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,647	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$13	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$1,254	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,914**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$50	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,158	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$8,452	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,254	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$10,914**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Plymouth, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Plymouth Ice Center Renovations	1	GO	$ 2,203	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,203	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,203	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Plymouth Ice Center Renovations

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,203
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	City of Plymouth requests $2,203,000 in state funds for the renovation of the Plymouth Ice Center.

Project Description

The City of Plymouth is requesting a $2,203.000 capital appropriation to make needed renovations to one of the state's largest and best-used athletic complexes – the Plymouth Ice Center. The bond proceeds will be used for the predesign, design, construction, furnishing, and equipping the renovation of the 18-year old Plymouth Ice Center (PIC). The facility was constructed in 1997 and is in need of basic upgrades to ensure that the infrastructure is maintained and continues to be a public asset to the region and state.

The Plymouth Ice Center (PIC) is one of the largest ice center facilities in the state of Minnesota serving as a local, regional and state venue for practices, games, tournaments and events. PIC provides 127,500 square feet of indoor space and includes three ice sheets, training center, meeting rooms, concessions, locker rooms, and seating for 1,700.

The major components of the renovation will address the federally-mandated R-22 refrigerant conversion, Olympic to Professional size rink conversion, roof replacement, parking lot repairs and furnishings and equipment updates.

PROJECT SCOPE

Mandated R-22 Refrigerant Conversion –As part of the Montreal Protocol, the R-22 refrigerant is being phased out due to its high Ozone depleting potential. Beginning in 2020 there will be no new manufactured R-22. As result, PIC will need to convert the R-22 refrigerant systems on two sheet of ice to an Ammonia (R717) based system. Ammonia is already used on the newest sheet of ice (build in 2004) in anticipation of the mandate. The conversion would result in utility and operational savings of approximately $20,000 annually.

Rink Size Conversion- Resize the rink from Olympic to professional size and replace the sand floor with concrete. This will have multiple benefits including; more usable ice space because Olympic sheets are not right-sized for youth events and create more dry-floor space during the off-season for other activities, such as expos and community events. The combination of the smaller sheet of ice and converting the floor to concrete will yield an estimated 28 percent annual electric savings for this sheet of ice.

Roof Replacement- The roof is original to the facility built in 1997. The facility has a flat roof with an outdated roof system technology which needs to be replaced to eliminate the leaking, and water damage to the infrastructure as well as to provide improved energy efficiencies.

Parking Lot Replacement- The parking lot is deteriorating (pitting, potholes, cracking) and in need of a mill and asphalt overlay to bring the paved surface back to a “like-new” condition. As well, additional parking spaces will be added to address the increased usage demand of the facility.

Additional Facility Improvements – HVAC replacement; rubber flooring; Dehumidification Desiccant Wheel; Dasher Boards; Scoreboards; Roof Air Exchange Unit; Energy Management System and Electronic Reader Board.

FUNDING SOURCES/COST -

The total project is estimated (with inflationary costs) at $4,467,000. This request contains $2,203,000 in state bond proceeds for basic infrastructure improvements to the arena. The City will pay over half of the total project cost of $2,264,000.

Project Rationale

The Plymouth Ice Center (PIC) renovation project will help preserve the existing infrastructure of the publicly owned and operated facility. This project will address the federally-mandated R-22 refrigerant conversion, infrastructure repairs, as well as facility renovations that will provide energy efficient enhancements. The renovation project is needed to ensure the safe and long-term demands of a regional sports facility.

PIC was constructed in 1997 and is in need of basic upgrades to ensure the resource is maintained and kept up with the public service demands of a regional, state and national amateur sports facility. Plymouth Ice Center (PIC) is owned and operated by the City of Plymouth and is one of Minnesota’s largest and busiest ice arenas. Visitors to the arena contribute millions each year to the regional and state economy. Annually the facility has more than one-half million visitors, hosts more than 20 tournaments that draw over 400 teams. PIC is serving hockey and skating enthusiasts across the metro (300 teams), region, state and nation (100 teams).

Plymouth is a regional center.

- Seventh largest city in the state
- Population of 75,000
- More than 50,000 jobs
- In terms of jobs and population, Plymouth is on par with Rochester, Mankato, Duluth and St. Cloud
- The City of Plymouth funds facilities that people from across the region and state use

The Plymouth Ice Center is a statewide asset.

- Minnesota’s second largest community-based ice center
- One of the busiest arenas in Minnesota. Annually draws more than one-half million visitors each year from across the state
- PIC has welcomed teams from 50 of the 87 counties in Minnesota, as well as North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Canada
- Hosts more than 20 local, regional and statewide tournaments – serving more than 400 teams per year
- Home ice for Wayzata boys and girls high school hockey, as well as Providence Academy

- Home ice to the nation's second largest youth hockey association, serving more than 1,000 boys and girls ages 6-18.
- The Plymouth Ice Center has positive economic impact on the metro area as visitors travel from across the state and country

Other Considerations

This is Truly a Capital Investment. All of these essential items will have life of 20 years or longer. This is a capital investment in the truest sense.

Local Match. The City of Plymouth will pay over half of the total project costs.

Plymouth: A Proven Partner. Plymouth has proven itself to be a good steward of state tax dollars.

- Plymouth parlayed the state's original $350,000 investment in 1996 into a regional amenity and state asset.
- The City of Plymouth has committed more than $14 million in local funding to build and expand the arena

Plymouth has made a commitment to the region by developing and maintaining a quality arena that is utilized by skaters from throughout the state and beyond.

- Plymouth taxpayers stepped up. Local taxpayers were asked to fund the arena in 1996 – and they did by approving a referendum.
- Over the years, the City of Plymouth has delivered on that taxpayer investment by developing and maintaining one of the state's premier and most well-utilized ice skating venues.
- Additionally, the city has expanded the arena, adding a third sheet of ice, by partnering with a local school and using city funds to finance it.

The City of Plymouth is a responsible partner.

- Carefully balanced our revenue and expenditures
- Generated enough annual revenue to cover operating costs and smaller capital items
- State dollars will only fund items that will have a useful life of 20 years or more. These are solid capital investments.

Plymouth has proven its commitment to the region and state through its construction, operation and expansion of the Plymouth Ice Center.

- We are asking that state lawmakers give our relatively modest request the same consideration given to other regional centers and facilities.
- We ask that the state recognize that commitment by granting our request for $2,203,000 to address renovation and repairs at the Plymouth Ice Center.
- Doing so will benefit the more than one-half million visitors who regularly travel from across the

state and beyond to the Plymouth Ice Center, one of Minnesota's largest and busiest ice arenas.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

The City of Plymouth

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Plymouth

Who will use or occupy this space?

No state bonding dollars will be used on the training facility. Acceleration Minnesota NW is leasing 7,500 square feet of space that was just added to the facility in 2014. This section of the facility is not scheduled for renovation thus no state funds will be used to benefit this entity. In 2014, the City of Plymouth entered into a public-private partnership between Acceleration Minnesota NW and Wayzata Youth Hockey Association for the construction of a 7,500 square foot training facility at the Plymouth Ice Center. The new space is leased to Acceleration Minnesota NW, who will operate the dry land training facility. In addition, Wayzata Youth Hockey Association contributed 40% of the overall construction costs for the facility. Acceleration Minnesota NW, a Plymouth Company entered into a 10-year lease agreement with the City of Plymouth. The training space provides athletic training and skill development for all sports programs (i.e. soccer, baseball, basketball, football, hockey, etc.). This partnership has provided several benefits/opportunities: *Growing trend for ice center facilities *Convenience for training facility customers *Enhanced access to health, wellness and nutrition guidance (including concussion awareness) *Potential for increased ice rental and concessions revenue *Provides valuable off-ice revenue ($64,980+ per year) to help offset facility improvements and future repairs (i.e. refrigerant conversion, roof repair/replacement, etc.). *Without a new source of revenue, it will be difficult for the PIC enterprise fund to operate without a levy in the long term *The training facility space will recoup capital construction costs within a 10 year period

Public Purpose

The Plymouth Ice Center (PIC) is a regional and statewide asset. The PIC has welcomed teams from 50 of the 87 counties in Minnesota, as well as North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Canada. Annually the facility hosts more than 20 local, regional and statewide tournaments – serving more than 400 teams per year. Some of those groups include; Minnesota Hockey, Minnesota Super Series, Minnesota Regional Tournaments, Minnesota State Tournaments, Bazzachini Hockey Training Camps, AAA Independent, etc. Additionally, the Plymouth Ice Center serves as home ice to the Wayzata High School boys and girls hockey team, Providence Academy, Armstrong/Cooper Youth Hockey and Wayzata Youth Hockey Association, one of the nation's largest hockey programs for boys and girls ages 6-18.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Dave Callister
City Manager
763-509-5301
dcallister@plymouthmn.gov

($ in thousands)

Plymouth Ice Center Renovations

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,203	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$2,264	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,467**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$18	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$333	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$370	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,794	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$396	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$556	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,467**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Polk County

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
North Country Food Bank	1	GO	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

North Country Food Bank

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$3 million in state funds is requested to design, construct, furnish and equip a new building for North Country Food Bank, Inc. to be located in Crookston, Minnesota.

Project Description

The proposed project consists of the new construction of a 30,000 square foot food bank facility that contains the following:

- 22,000 square feet of warehousing space, with 20-foot high side walls. High side walls allow maximized storage capacity, thus using warehouse space in the most effective and efficient manner. The warehouse space will include:
- 1,820 square feet of freezer space;
- 1,225 square feet of cooler space;
- 595 square feet of high-temperature cooler space;
- 3,072 square feet of clean room/repack space; and
- 15,288 square feet of storage space.
- 8,000 square feet of office and program space.
- Two recessed truck docks to allow North Country to handle incoming and outgoing trucks simultaneously.

The estimated total project cost is $6 million. Key funding sources and estimated costs for the project are listed on the attached spreadsheet.

Project Rationale

North Country Food Bank, Inc. (North Country) is a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization located in Crookston, MN. North Country has a profound regional impact on hunger issues – serving 21 counties in northwest and west central Minnesota. North Country provides surplus, quality food and nonfood products to 220 charitable organizations for distribution to people in need. The charitable food programs served by North Country include soup kitchens, food shelves, homeless shelters, low-income individuals in need of supplemental assistance, senior community centers, after-school programs, domestic abuse programs, and addiction treatment centers.

North Country's current facility poses the following challenges:

Space limitations that are contributing to

- Inadequate food storage capacity;
- Operation inefficiencies due to numerous locations;
- Limitations on the amount of donated food that can be accepted and stored safely – especially refrigerated/frozen products and produce;
- Increased costs associated with storing frozen product offsite;
- Issues with storing produce and agricultural surplus products in a manner that provides for the longest life possible of the products.
- Inability to house and operate a licensed clean room for product repacking.
- Continuous maintenance and upkeep due to the age of the building and the sheer volume of the food passing through on a daily basis.
- Truck access issues.
- Parking shortages for clients, volunteers and staff.
- Logistical concerns affecting North Country's ability to meet the requirements of agencies receiving food.
- Failure to meet the contractual space and storage requirements of Feeding America.
- Inability to pass new, mandatory safety inspections required by Feeding America and other governing agencies.

North Country must move its operations to a new facility in order to comply with the contractual obligations and safety requirements of Feeding America and other governing agencies.

North Country provides an important service that impacts the lives of many in northwest and west central Minnesota. North Country's work also has a major, positive economic impact.

- North Country brings in more than 7.4 million pounds of nutritious food products, including donated product, purchased product and federal commodities, to northwest and west central Minnesota. This is equivalent to approximately 5.8 million meals.
- North Country's ability to handle and distribute more food will result in fewer people having to choose between paying for food and paying for other basic necessities, including, rent, medical prescriptions, gas, heat, etc.
- North Country will be able to provide greater access to food for people living in rural areas.
- North Country's increased food handling capabilities will provide a positive return on investment for all communities served in the form of 1) reduced health care costs; 2) increased productivity; and 3) reduced behavioral issues among people in need receiving food. *Minnesota Cost/Benefit Hunger Impact Study (2010)*.
- Families travel from surrounding areas to each of the communities served by North Country to obtain food from partner agencies. The receipt of food from partner agencies allows clients to stretch their budgets, leaving them with funds to pay for necessities and to patronize other local

businesses in their communities.

The make-up of North Country's service area, which is very large geographically, but not heavily populated, makes it challenging for North Country to raise the funds necessary to construct a suitable facility, while at the same time raising the funds necessary to maintain and expand current service levels. The service and work North Country provides throughout northwest and west central Minnesota is important to the well-being and future of all the communities served. Polk County seeks to assist North Country with this building project in order to insure the success of the project and the continued success and positive impact of North Country's work throughout the region.

Other Considerations

The public purpose of this facility is to address hunger issues and help provide food and access to food for people in need in northwest and west central Minnesota. Polk County will serve as the fiscal sponsor of this project to help insure the necessary facility is built to allow North Country to continue and expand its operations and meet its space and storage contractual obligations and food safety requirements. Local units of government, as well as the state and federal government have long recognized the importance and necessity of food banks and their work to provide food to those in need. North Country already works with and/or contracts with the State of Minnesota and the federal government to carry out food distribution under several different programs, including: USDA TEFAP, USDA CSFP, the State of Minnesota Milk Grant Program, and the State of Minnesota Farm to Foodhself Program.

North Country's ability to continue and expand its services will have a profound impact on the well-being of those in need across northwest and west central Minnesota, as well as a significant positive impact on all of the communities served by North Country's work. North Country provides food to 220 charitable organizations, in more than 75 communities, in 21 counties across northwest and west central Minnesota. North Country's work provides positive health benefits, economic benefits and behavioral benefits for those in need of assistance, as well as the communities they live in.

The entire scope of North Country's operations is focused on serving the public and helping those in need. The construction of this new facility will allow North Country to provide even more programming and service to the public.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

This project will have little to no impact on Polk County's operating budget over the upcoming six-year period. This is a one-time request for matching funding in the amount of $3 million for the construction of a new facility. Upon the completion of construction, the facility will be operated and maintained by North Country. No new or additional state operating dollars will be requested for this project.

Who will own the facility?

Polk County, Minnesota

Who will operate the facility?

The facility will be operated by North Country Food Bank, Inc.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Polk County and North Country Food Bank, Inc. will enter into a 25 year lease agreement for North Country's use of the facility for its food bank operations. Polk County will maintain oversight of the facility and its use. North Country will be fully responsible for its food bank operations and the maintenance, upkeep and operation of the facility.

Public Purpose

The public purpose of this facility and project are description under "Other Considerations" above.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There are no previous appropriations for this project.

Project Contact Person

Charles S. Whiting
Polk County Administrator
218-281-5408
chuck.whiting@co.polk.mn.us

($ in thousands)

North Country Food Bank

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$420	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$3,107	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,527**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$190	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$5	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$30	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$125	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,195	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$30	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$425	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$527	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,527**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Interstate Highway 694/Rice Street Interchange	1	GO	$ 20,500	$ 0	$ 0
Battle Creek Winter Recreation	2	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Improvements to Ramsey County Landmark Center	3	GO	$ 300	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 22,800	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 22,800	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Interstate Highway 694/Rice Street Interchange

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$20,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$20.5 million to replace a functionally-deficient interchange at Interstate Highway 694 and Rice Street in the Cities of Little canada, Shoreview, and Vadnais Heights in Ramsey County.

Project Description

The proposed $20.5 million project will replace a functionally-deficient interchange with one that would safely and efficiently accommmodate movements between Rice Street, a Class A Minor Arterial Highway, and the I-694 Principal Arterial. On I-694, where a third lane in each direction will be built to alleviate the existing seven-plus hours of daily congestion, the project will eliminate a pinch point where adequate shoulders cannot be built due to inadequate width under the existing bridge.

I-694 in the area of the the Rice Street Interchange, currently experiences over five hours of congestion per day. The cost of this congestion is roughly $8 million per year. While the additional lanes being built under the Corridors of Commerce project will alleviate the congestion, safety and capacity will still be compromised by the inadequate space under the Rice Street Interchange Bridge. This project would eliminate that problem.

Project Rationale

During planning for expansion of this segment of I-694, a concept was developed for a partial cloverleaf interchange at Rice Street to accommodate additional general-purpose lanes to the west and to interface with the "Unweave the Weave" project at the I-694/I-35E Interchange to the east. In light of more recent traffic projections, this proposal would explore "smaller and smarter" interchange designs. When completed, the interchange would provide enhanced levels of service and safety to complement the planned general-purpose lane construction on I-694, a Corridors of Commerce project scheduled for construction in 2016 and 2017.

Other Considerations

Interstate Highway 694 is the designated route for freight carriers to bypass the I-94 corridor between the downtown areas of St. Paul and Minneapolis. In this function, approximately seven percent of the daily traffic volume consists of heavy trucks. The traffic volume on I-694 east of the interchange, is 101,000 vehicles per day; west of the interchange it is 89,000 vehicles per day. Rice Street is a Class A Minor Arterial Highway-Reliever, providing relief to I-35E, as an alternate north/south route between St. Paul and the suburbs to the north.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

When completed, the project will have no significant impact on either Ramsey County's or MnDOT's operating budget. The modernization and improved geometrics are expected to reduce maintenance costs slightly.

Who will own the facility?

The interchange bridge and ramps will be owned by MnDOT; the Rice Street portion of the project will be owned by Ramsey County.

Who will operate the facility?

Ramsey County will operate Rice Street and the traffic signals at ramp terminals and adjacent intersections; MnDOT will operate I-694.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The proposed project will improve access from Rice Street to I-694 and improve travel along I-694 for all road users. As the designated freight bypass for I-94, goods moving through the region by truck will be better accommodated. Benefitting businesses immediately adjacent to this segment of I-694 include: Land O' Lakes world headquarters, Boston Scientific Cardiac Products, Smith Medical, Deluxe Corporation, PAR Systems, Intri-Con Corporation, Hill-Rom, Cummins Power Systems, Tsi Inc., Mead Metals, Adobe Software, and Hako Minuteman Inc.

Public Purpose

I-694 is part of the Interstate Highway system and is open to and serves the general public. Likewise, Rice Street is a County State Aid Highway, open to and serving the general public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jim Tolaas
Ramsey County Public Works Director
651-266-7116
james.tolaas@co.ramsey.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Interstate Highway 694/Rice Street Interchange

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$20,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$6,600	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$27,100**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$250	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,250	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$18,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,661	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$23,161**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Battle Creek Winter Recreation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	This request is for $2,000,000 in state bond funding to design, construct and equip the Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area located in the City of St. Paul, Ramsey County, with a permanent snow-making system for cross-country skiing, downhill skiing, tubing and sledding. A $2,000,000 match would be raised for a project total of $4,000,000.

Project Description

Battle Creek Regional Park is a 1440 acre park located in the cities of St. Paul and Maplewood. The park is owned and operated by Ramsey County. There are currently 14 kilometers of cross-country ski trails within the park, 3.8 kilometers of which are lighted. The project will install a permanment snowmaking wystem on 2.5 kilometers of the lighted ski trail, a teaching/training are for downhill skiing and snowboarding, and a recreational tubing/sledding area. The snowmaking system will be designed with sufficient capacity to establish a cross-country ski trail with an 18-inch base of snow over a period of 7 to 10 days at temperatures of 27 degrees F or less. Key elements of the system will include construction of a reservoir to cool the water for efficient snowmaking; pumping station and high pressure welded steel pipe and hydrants to distribute water; electrical connections and fixtures for snowmaking; portable snowmaking guns and grooming equipment to grade the snow (mobile equipment items will be provided by Ramsey County as part of the local match); a rope tow for downhill skiing/snowboarding and tubing/sliding and a seasonal building to house the pumping station and storage of snowmaking and grooming equipment.

Project Rationale

In 2005, in light of the unpredictable snow conditions at the time, the Minnesota Nordic Ski Association and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources hosted a meeting of cross-country ski facility operators and advocates to discuss the status of Nordic skiing in the State. Participants agreed that the future of Nordic skiing in the State depends on predictable snow (i.e., cross-country ski snowmaking). Moreover, the presence of skiable cross-country snow in the Metropolitan Area is essentatial to maintainiung participation at Greater Minnesota cross-country ski areas and events such as cross-country ski races.

Battle Creek Regional Park was identified as a priority site for snowmaking. The area is a well-established regional cross-country ski area, has excellent highway access, is located within minutes of downtown St. Paul and is currently the venue of choice for sectional and regional high school cross-country ski competitions. Battle Creek was the host site for the American Cross-Country Skiers National Masters Ski Race in 2000. Since that time, numerous other regional, state and local events have been planned, but subsequently cancelled due to lack of snow.

Other Considerations

The project has broad support from recreational cross-country skiers, area school districts, local and national ski race directors, the St. Paul Convention Bureau and potential corporate sponsors.

The Battle Creek Winter Recreation Area with predictable snow will provide an outstanding, world-class venue for National, State, Regional and local cross-country ski events. These events will draw thousands of athletes and spectators to the region, contribute substantially to Minnesota's tourism income, and position Minnesota to be America's #1 Nordic Skiing Destination.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Anticipated as part of Ramsey County Parks and Recreation operating budget with no cost to state

Who will own the facility?

Ramsey County

Who will operate the facility?

Ramsey County

Who will use or occupy this space?

none identified

Public Purpose

Parks and Recreation, High School and amateur sports

Description of Previous Appropriations

None from state sources

Project Contact Person

Jon Oyanagi
Director, Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department
651-748-2500
jon.oyanagi@co.ramsey.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Battle Creek Winter Recreation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$756	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$3,004	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$511	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,271**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Improvements to Ramsey County Landmark Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$300
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	Ramsey County and Minnesota Landmarks, the nonprofit managing agency for Landmark Center, are seeking $300,000 in state funding for the pre-design, design and pre-engineering for interior improvements to Landmark Center, the historic Old Federal Courts Building, located in St. Paul and owned by Ramsey County. The project is part of a multi-year plan to enhance and improve the Center, beginning with Phase I - Exterior Stabilization, currently underway. The project includes preliminary work to better utilize interior areas, including the unfinished North Tower, sixth floor, basement and sub-basement.

Project Description

The Pre-Design, Design and Pre-Engineering project will be the preliminary step in Phase II of the Landmark Center improvements. Upgrades to interior space will allow us to maximize leasable areas and restore and rennovate those areas in a way that preserves the building's historical elements. This will better utilize undeveloped areas, including possible expansion of a restaurant and other tenant capabilities. Other anticipated work includes structural repairs and reinforcements to bring areas of (presently unoccupied) historic floor structure up to modern codes, as well as building infrastructure renovation, to allow mothballed areas to become revenue-generating tenant spaces. This project follows Phase I-Exterior Improvements (currently underway), a $3,900,000 exterior restoration of Landmark Center's towers, roof system and masonry that is being conducted in 2013 through 2015. Phase I is funded mainly by Ramsey County ($3.5 million) with additional support from the Arts & Cultural Legacy Fund at the Minnesota Historical Society and other private funders. The Phase II implementation is estimated at approximately $4,000,000 to $6,000,000 in captial improvement costs.

Goals for the project:

- Preliminary design, design and pre-engineering to further enhance and improve under-utilized areas of the building and increase long-term leasable area and infrastructure capacity.
- Market analysis of Landmark Center and surrounding neighborhood for potential new economic opportunities, create new recreational activities within the building, and provide additional economic vitality to downtown Saint Paul.

Project Rationale

For over 110 years, Landmark Center served the state of Minnesota first as the Federal Building

from 1902 to 1965 and, subsequently, after a major restoration effort, as a national historic monument officially designated by the National Park Service, and as a center for the community's arts and cultural activities. Currently, 225,000 people a year come to the building for a myriad of arts, cultural and entertainment purposes. Nearly all of Landmark Center's community programs are free and open to the public (over 96%), making them accessible to all age groups, income levels, It is also home to 15 of Minnesota's outstanding arts and cultural nonprofit organizations, several of which are nationally recognized.

Landmark Center is located in the heart of downtown St. Paul's cultural district and is a stately frontispiece to Rice Park. Its renovation in the 1970s spurred investment in the Rice Park area that included renovation of The Saint Paul Hotel (1984), construction of the Ordway Center for the Performing Arts (1985) and construction of Travelers' new headquarters (1991). It continued with reinvestment in RiverCentre (1998), the Saint Paul Public Library (2002) and today, expansion of the Ordway Center (2013-14). As Landmark Center's purposes have changed in the years since it was renovated, so have the needs and uses of the facility. It is time to explore ways to update and expand the facility to better serve the education and entertainment needs of a modern public. When Landmark Center was restored and renovated in the 1970s through a mix of public and private suport, some areas remained untouchjed but were recommended for renovation in the 1974 report, "Reusing the Old Federal Courts Building for the Saint Paul Council of Arts and Sciences." The report called for the building to have "a variety of places where people can gather, eat and drink communicate, hear, see, use and interact with our culture... measurably adding to the quality of life in St. Paul."

Other Considerations

Renovation of un-restored, under-utilized areas of Landmark Center will provide Ramsey County with additional leasing revenue to assist in maintaining and supporting Landmark Center as a state and national Landmark, and will provide additional investment that will increase the economic and historic value of facility. Currently, Ramsey County spends approximately $1,000,000 per year to maintain and support the ongoing costs associated with the Landmark Center.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

By adding more useable space, anticipated revenue should alleviate pressure on the County's property tax levy (currently at approximately $1,000,000 per year for maintenance and support).

Who will own the facility?

Ramsey County

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Landmarks, on behalf of Ramsey County

Who will use or occupy this space?

Landmark Center's current long-term tenants include 15 local, state and national arts and cultural organizations and 5 commercial tenants.

Public Purpose

Landmark Center serves as one of Saint Paul's most historically and architecturally significant buildings, open daily to the public, free of charge, to explore, learn and enjoy. Nearly all of Landmark Center's community programs are free and open to the public (over 96%), making them accessible to all age groups, income levels and education levels.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Phase I was funded by Ramsey County($3.5 million), $127 million from the Minnesota Historical Society (through the Arts and Cultural Legacy Fund) $280,000 from private sources.

Project Contact Person

Amy Mino
Executive Director, Minnesota Landmarks
651-292-3285
amino@landmarkcenter.org

($ in thousands)

Improvements to Ramsey County Landmark Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$300	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$300	$0	$0
Appropriation Bonds	$0	$0	$4,000	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,600**	**$4,000**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$300	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$37	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$337**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Riverview Corridor	1	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Rush Line Corridor	2	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Union Pacific/BNSF Grade Separation	3	GO	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 5,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 5,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Riverview Corridor

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$2,000,000 in state funds is requested for predesign and design activities for the Riverview Corridor. This predesign and design work includes preliminary engineering and environmental studies required for application to the federal New Starts Program

Project Description

The Riverview Corridor will complete its Pre-Project Development Study in fall of 2016. This study will determine the 12 mi. corridor's locally preferred alternative (LPA). As part of determining the LPA, the Pre-Project Development Study will identify capital and operating costs for various mode (bus and rail) alternatives as well as alignments for the corridor. The Pre-Project Development Study has a cost of $1.45 million and is being funded through the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority. Upon selection of the LPA in 2016, the next step in the federal New Starts Program is the completion of environmental documentation, most likely a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The cost for the DEIS is currently estimated at $3.5 million. Following the DEIS the project will need to complete engineering. An estimate for engineering is not available at this time as it is dependent on the LPA.

Funding for the Riverview Corridor beyond the Pre-Project Development Study is assumed to be provided by the State, Local Governments, Federal Government, and the Counties Transit Improvement Board.

Project Rationale

This project will link growing communities and neighborhoods along the corridor from Union Depot to Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport to the Mall of America in Bloomington. The corridor is forecast to add 32,000 residents and 41,500 jobs by 2040. Additionally, the job and employment growth will lead to 241,000 new trips being made to, from and within the corridor by 2040. This project will increase mobility, stimulate economic development, and preserve community and environmental resources in the area.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Upon completion, the operating costs for the corridor will be the responsibility of Metro Transit and the Counties Transit Improvement Board.

Who will own the facility?

Upon construction of a transit improvement in the Riverview Corridor, the Metropolitan Council/Metro Transit will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit will be the operator of the Riverview Corridor as part of the region's transit system.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Not Applicable

Public Purpose

The Riverview Corridor is a public transportation investment that will provide mobility to all members of the public between the Mall of America in Bloomington, Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport, Union Depot in downtown St. Paul and the neighborhoods in between.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous requests have been related to the Pre-design/Design work following the Riverview Corridor Pre-Project Development Study.

Previously, in 2002 $46.1 million in state funding allocated to a busway project along the Riverview Corridor was rescinded due to the state budget deficit, lack of strong support for the project.

Project Contact Person

Michael Rogers
Transit Project Manager
651-266-2773
michael.rogers@co.ramsey.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Riverview Corridor

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$1,450	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,450**	**$3,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$1,450	$3,500	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,450**	**$3,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Yes
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Rush Line Corridor

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$2,000,000 in state funds is requested for predesign and design activities for the Rush Line Corridor. This predesign and design work includes preliminary engineering and environmental studies required for application to the federal New Starts Program

Project Description

The Rush Line Corridor will complete its Pre-Project Development Study in late 2015. This study will determine the 25 mi. corridor's locally preferred alternative (LPA). As part of determining the LPA, the Pre-Project Development Study will identify capital and operating costs for various mode (bus and rail) alternatives as well as alignments for the corridor. The Pre-Project Development Study has a cost of $1.485 million and is being funded with 80% federal funds and 20% non-federal funds provided by the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority, Anoka County, Washington County, Chisago County and Pine County. Upon selection of the LPA in the summer of 2016, the next step in the federal New Starts Program for the corridor is the completion of environmental documentation, most likely a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The cost for the DEIS is currently estimated at $3.5 million. Following the DEIS the project will need to complete engineering. An estimate for engineering is not available at this time as it is dependent on the LPA.

Funding for the Rush Line Corridor beyond the Pre-Project Development Study is assumed to be provided by the State, Local Governments, Federal Government, and the Counties Transit Improvement Board.

Project Rationale

This project will link growing communities and neighborhoods along the corridor from Union Depot to Forest Lake/White Bear Lake. The corridor is forecast to add 108,000 residents and 72,000 jobs by 2040. Additionally, the job and employment growth will be in different areas of the corridor leading to the need to connect them to one another. Trips are forecast to lead to 400,000 new trips being made to, from and within the corridor by 2040. This project will increase mobility, stimulate economic development, and preserve community and environmental resources in the area.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No impact at this time.

Who will own the facility?

Upon construction of a transit improvement in the Rush Line Corridor, the Metropolitan Council/Metro Transit will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit will be the operator of the Rush Line Corridor as part of the region's transit system.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Not Applicable

Public Purpose

The Rush Line Corridor is a public transportation investment that will provide mobility to all members of the public between Forest Lake/White Bear Lake, Union Depot in downtown St. Paul and the neighborhoods in between.

Description of Previous Appropriations

$700,000 in state funds have previously been committed to the larger Rush Line Corridor. These funds were used with the corridor as defined by Union Depot north to Hinckley. They were used to match federal and non-federal local funds for the following capital projects:

1. Chisago County Vanpool - van purchase
2. Forest Lake Transit Center - construction
3. Maplewood Mall Transit Center - construction

In 2014 an unsuccessful request was made for $2,000,000 for the predesign and design phases of the Rush Line Corridor. This predesign and design work includes preliminary engineering and environmental studies required for application to the federal New Starts Program.

Project Contact Person

Michael Rogers
Transit Project Manager
651-266-2773
michael.rogers@co.ramsey.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Rush Line Corridor

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$1,188	$0	$0	$0
County Funds	$297	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,485**	**$3,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$1,485	$3,500	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,485**	**$3,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Yes
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Union Pacific/BNSF Grade Separation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,000
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	$1,000,000 in state funds is requested for Predesign and Design activities for the Union Pacific Railroad/BNSF Railway (UP/BNSF) Grade Separation Project. This Predesign and Design work includes environmental design and engineering required for the completion of a grade separation of UP and BNSF track adjacent to Westminster Junction to the east of downtown St. Paul.

Project Description

The rail lines in the Twin Cities East Metro area constitute critical links for the movement of freight rail traffic for the Upper Midwest and the United States and nation. Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority (RCRRA), in financial partnership with BNSF Railway (BNSF), Canadian Pacific Railway (CP) and Union Pacific Railroad (UP), are working together to plan and design the UP/BNSF Grade Separation Project to address the significant freight rail congestion in this area.

The East Metro Rail Capacity Study (2012) completed by the RCRRA in partnership with BNSF, CP and UP focused on improving the entire system for freight as well as existing and potential passenger trains. This study quantified the existing and future delay experienced by the freight railroads between downtown St. Paul and Hastings, Minnesota, and identified a phased set of improvements to reduce delay and allow for the potential introduction of additional passenger rail service.

Without capacity improvements, the East Metro freight rail network will not be able to accommodate the forecast increase in freight rail traffic resulting in increased delay, reduced travel time reliability and greater volatility in on-time performance. One of the identified improvements from the East Metro Rail Capacity Study was a grade separation of UP and BNSF track between Westminster Junction and 7th Street. Without relief at this bottleneck, there will be adverse effects on the efficiency and reliability of freight rail movements locally, with a potential rippling effect regionally and beyond. When constructed the grade separation project will improve BNSF mainline capacity by creating a continuous, grade separated UP route. The grade separation will also benefit BNSF and CP as CP trains utilize the BNSF tracks through is area to travel between their St. Paul Yard and Shoreham Yard in Minneapolis.

In addition to the benefits provided to the railroads, the general public will reap significant benefits through reductions in freight and passenger train delay, improved efficiency in the delivery of materials and goods, improved safety, avoidance of diversions to highway freight movement, and decreased emissions.

Funding for the UP/BNSF Grade Separation Project beyond the Environmental and Design work is assumed to be provided by the Union Pacific Railroad, BNSF Railway, Canadian Pacific Railroad, State, Local Governments, and Federal Government though specific funding amounts have yet to be determined.

Project Rationale

Freight rail activity in the East Metro Area from three Class 1 railroads and passenger railroad activity from Amtrak is constrained to certain corridors where acceptable grades allow trains to transition from the Mississippi River to the top of the bluffs. The primary location for this transition is just east of St. Paul, or the East Metro Area. This crossroads handles more than 10,000 rail cars a day pulled on more than 110 trains per day, or 5% of the nation's freight volume. Freight rail lines are congested through this area today and without improvements, the average train speed will degrade as rail traffic increases. The East Metro Area is also the route for Amtrak passenger service and the chosen route for future high speed rail service to Milwaukee and Chicago.

Other Considerations

None

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None, Union Pacific Railroad and BNSF Railway will operate and maintain the structure.

Who will own the facility?

Union Pacific Railroad and BNSF Railway would own the completed project as it is on their property.

Who will operate the facility?

Union Pacific Railroad and BNSF Railway would operate the facility as it is on their property.

Who will use or occupy this space?

BNSF Railway and Union Pacific Railroad will own, operate and maintain the grade separation and its associated track and signal infrastructure. They, in addition to Canadian Pacific Railway, and other short line railroads will operate trains over the infrastructure consistent with their trackage agreements.

Public Purpose

Improvements to the transportation system increase regional mobility which provides business with greater access to markets and employees allowing them to grow and increase their workforces. Residents benefit through improved safety, access to jobs, and a lower cost for goods/services through more efficient and lower cost transportation options.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous appropriations have been related to the UP/BNSF Grade Separation Project.

Project Contact Person

Michael Rogers
Transit Project Manager
651-266-2773
michael.rogers@co.ramsey.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Union Pacific/BNSF Grade Separation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$1,680	$0	$0	$0
County Funds	$420	$125	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$375	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$2,100**	**$1,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$2,100	$1,500	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$167	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$2,100**	**$1,667**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

Red Wing, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Red Wing River Town Renaissance	1	GO	$ 4,480	$ 0	$ 0
Mississippi River Walk Trail and Trailhead	2	GO	$ 8,627	$ 0	$ 0
West Red Wing Public Safety Facility	3	GO	$ 2,600	$ 0	$ 0
Highway Rail Grade Separation at Sturgeon Lake Road	4	GO	$ 14,762	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 30,469	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 30,469	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Red Wing River Town Renaissance

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,480
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$4.48 million in State funds are needed and requested to fund Phase 2 of the Red Wing River Town Renaissance project.

Project Description

The Red Wing River Town Renaissance project proposal combines multiple primary construction projects efficiently. The River Town Renaissance project was partially funded in 2014 with a Capital Budget appropriation of $1.56 million. The 2014 appropriation is being used for Phase 1 of the project which is leveraging $1.377 million in other state funds and $7.381 million in non-state funds. The cost for Phase 1 is $10.3 million and includes: the combined Levee Road reconstruction, utility replacements, partial harbor bulkhead retaining wall replacement and parking improvements, construction of Segment 1 of the River Walk Trail between Bay Point Park and Levee Park; preliminary design work for Levee Park River Boat Dockage and Promenade improvements; engineering, architectural design, and contracted work for the Sheldon Theatre.

The 2016 request of $4.480 million is to fund Phase 2, the balance of the original 2014 project proposal. The 2016 project components include: removal and replacement of approximately 250 lineal feet of small boat harbor bulkhead retaining wall; T. B. Sheldon Theatre restoration, rehabilitation, and renovation; riverboat/transient boat dockage, levee wall extension, and Levee Park promenade enhancements.

The first project is the removal and replacement of approximately 250 lineal feet of adjoining small harbor bulkhead retaining wall that will complete the replacement of deteriorated harbor retaining wall. The estimated cost for this project is $910,885.

The second project is the completion of the renovations and the rehabilitation at the T. B. Sheldon Theatre. The Arts are a significant economic engine within the region and the T.B. Sheldon Theatre serves as the hub of the region's performing arts scene. With limited venues for performing arts outside the Twin City metro area, the Sheldon Theatre works with regional partners and attracts patrons from all over the states of Wisconsin, Minnesota and points much further afar to the Red Wing area. Funding in the amount of $1,362,155 for restoration and rehabilitation of the Theatre is necessary to fully fund the project.

With such broad geographic participation, the Sheldon Theatre has become a key partner in the region's important tourism and arts industry; attracting visitors and the economic impact they provide help fuel the regional economy. The Sheldon Theatre is a reason for a visit to the Red Wing area, it is a destination stop.

The proposed renovations at the Theatre include: ADA compliant public restrooms, flooring repair/replacement, roof replacement, decorative stonework repair, painting and plaster repair, electrical switchgear, fire alarm controls, and general interior rehabilitation and renovations. All of the programmed improvements and upgrades are vital to maintain the viability and competitiveness

of the Sheldon Theatre as a regional Performing Arts Center.

As a major public assembly building within the region, maintaining the building's appearance, functionality, and safety systems is crucial to the successful and prospering Arts Industry in the region.

The Phase 1 & 2 project budget for the T. B. Sheldon Theatre project is $2.432 million. The 2016 request of $1,362,155 would be leveraged with approximately $1.07 million in other funds.

The third project within this request is transient and riverboat dockage, levee wall, and promenade improvements at Levee Park. The 2016 request of $2,206,960 is to fully fund the proposed project. Although the grant agreement has not been finalized, the improvements proposed at Levee Park were funded with $800,000 from the 2014 Port Development Assistance program. Also, the Red Wing Port Authority has applied for $800,000 in 2015 Port Development Assistance funding for the project. The estimated cost for this project is $4.210 million.

The boat dockage installation and enhancements, extension of the levee wall and general improvements to the promenade at Levee Park have been identified as needed critical projects in several city action plans that are adopted as part of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Safe and easily accessible transient dockage for recreational boaters and riverboat cruise passengers at a 'downtown' location is an identified, specific action to connect seasonal tourists with area businesses.

Red Wing has had an outstanding, long-term relationship with the Mississippi River cruise lines. Both the American Queen Steamboat Company and the American Cruise Ship Lines have made Red Wing a port of call on their Upper Mississippi River cruise itinerary's for many years. The American Queen, the Queen of the Mississippi, and the brand new American Eagle paddle wheelers all make multiple stops at Red Wing annually. The two cruise lines combine for 11 upper Mississippi River cruises, making 22 stops in Red Wing in an average year.

The exciting national announcement by Viking River Cruises naming Red Wing as a Minnesota port of call for their inaugural 2017 Mississippi River excursion touring season has expedited the need and demand for boat dockage and the Levee Park project. The Viking River Cruise boats are anticipated to be slightly smaller than the American Queen paddle boat at 413 feet in length with a 63 foot beam. The approximate boat passenger capacity could be up to 335 persons on Viking's ships. Viking Cruise Lines expects to inaugurate 5 upper Mississippi River cruises in 2017, making 10 stops in Red Wing. In one cruise season over 10,000 passengers will embark in Red Wing from Viking and other riverboat passenger ships having a positive impact on the regional economy.

Project Rationale

The Red Wing River Town Renaissance is an exciting shovel-ready phased project that will enhance the State and region's economic development and job creation goals while addressing significant public safety and environmental challenges. The city is requesting $4.48 million that will be leveraged with other funding to complete Phase 2 of the 2014 Red Wing River Town Renaissance project proposal.

Red Wing is a regional trade center. Economically, the city's and area businesses benefit from tourism, significant regional agricultural and manufacturing commerce, and recreational activities.

The Red Wing River Town Renaissance proposal combines multiple public benefit projects. The projects will have a regional benefit and will enhance Red Wing's position as a regional economic center. Completion of the three remaining projects will have a measurable economic impact on the

local and regional economy.

Phase 1 of the Red Wing River Town Renaissance will complete the reconstruction of Levee Road between Jackson and Broad Streets and Segment 1 of the River Walk Trail. The project received a 2014 Capital Bonding appropriation and is addressing public safety i.e, reconstructing a turn-of-the century and antiquated road system, alleviating routine road flooding, assisting in ensuring uninterrupted grain transport, improving access to a regionally vital riverfront grain storage facility and export terminal, and various commercial businesses, and replacement of a portion of the small boat harbor bulkhead retaining wall. River Walk Trail, Segment 1, will provide a direct connection to Red Wing's Historic Downtown from the Cannon River Trail and the Goodhue Pioneer State Trail through two city riverfront parks, Bay Point Park and Levee Park. This work is under contract.

Phase 1 of the River Town Renaissance also included initiation of the conceptual and preliminary engineering and design work for Levee Park transient boat dockage and promenade improvements and the engineering/architectural design work for the Sheldon Theatre renovations.

Also included within Phase 1, the city authorized and executed a construction contract for the completion of the exterior tuck-pointing work, completed the heating/ventilation work, and replaced sound and lighting theatrical equipment for the Sheldon Theatre. This work for the Sheldon Theatre was initiated and completed due to the urgency of need.

Phase 2 of the Red Wing River Town Renaissance includes three project components within the original 2014 request. 1) Replace approximately 250 lineal feet of adjoining small boat harbor bulkhead retaining wall; 2) Complete the planned renovations for the Sheldon Theatre; and 3) Construction of transient and riverboat dockage, levee wall extension and promenade improvements at Levee Park.

Other Considerations

Phase 1 of the project, Levee Road reconstruction and the construction of a segment of the River Walk Trail from Bay Point Park to Levee Park, are designed and were bid September 2015 and are under contract. It is a scheduled project and has a two-year construction period, ending late in the fall of 2016. In addition, at the Sheldon Theatre, exterior tuck-pointing work, heating/ventilation work, and replacement of sound and lighting theatrical equipment was initiated due to urgency of need.

Phase 1 of the project costs are approximately $10.3 million. Phase 1 project costs have been leveraged with 71.5 percent of non-state funds. When combined, Phase 1 and 2 total project costs are estimated to be $16.5 million with approximately $7.5 million leveraged with state funds. The city is requesting that any appropriation will not be subject to the match requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 16A.86 Subd. 4 (a.).

Further, the city requests that funds expended to complete Phase 1 and 2 of the Red Wing River Town Renaissance since January 1, 2013, shall count toward any matching requirement.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will use or occupy this space?

The transient/riverboat dockage will, on occasion, be temporarily utilized by private entities for debarking and embarking passengers and supplies during the riverboat cruise season, July thru October. The average dockage time period is between 4 to 8 hours. Each cruise ship also, on occasion, may have one 24-hour layover at Red Wing each cruise season. The recreational boating season typically occurs May thru October and the riverboat cruise season, as stated previously, is July thru October. Once completed, the dockage would be utilized by the current riverboat cruise ship lines approximately 180 hours during the boating season. Upon Viking Cruise Lines' entry into the market, the usage may double in use to 360 total hours during a boating season. During a majority of the boating season time, the dockage would be available for public use.

Public Purpose

The project will reconstruct a public roadway to enhance roadway safety, facilitate commerce and eliminate obsolescence; construct a recreational trail, mitigate road flooding and high water shoreline erosion, construct public boat dockage, improve public parkland, and renovate the region's performing arts facility. The project will provide the region with new, unique recreational opportunities. The project will have a positive economic development impact upon the regional market area. The identified project activities will benefit the community and the surrounding region both aesthetically and economically. The projects will be completed for the benefit of the public and could only be reasonably undertaken by a public entity.

Description of Previous Appropriations

2014 H.F. No. 2490.3, Subd. 16 appropriated $1,560,000 for the Red Wing River Town Renaissance project.

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Finance Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Red Wing River Town Renaissance

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$2,360	$4,480	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$1,377	$0	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$867	$0	$0	$0
City Funds	$3,919	$2,523	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
General Fund Cash	$0	$800	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$200	$0	$0
	$0			
TOTAL	**$8,523**	**$8,003**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$1,042	$1,632	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$6,430	$5,568	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$1,051	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$804	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$8,523**	**$8,004**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Mississippi River Walk Trail and Trailhead

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,627
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$8.627 million in State funds are needed in FY 2016 and requested to fund the Red Wing River Walk Trail project. A continuation of the city's River Town Renaissance initiative, the proposed trail will connect the city's Mississippi River waterfront parks: Levee Park, Barn Bluff Park and Covill Park; and provide a unique multi-modal experience and connect to the existing regional trail system.

Project Description

This request is for $8.627 million in state funding to leverage city and other funding to construct Segments 2 and 3 of the River Walk Trail along the western bank of the Mississippi River. The completed trail segments will link historic Levee Park in Downtown Red Wing to a regional park, historic Barn Bluff, and end at the city's regionally popular and multi-use Covill Park.

Planning for the project was initiated in 2005 with the completion of a feasibility study for the trail project. In 2009, a preliminary engineering report and design was completed. The engineering report included a full environmental assessment, analysis of project permitting and evaluation of engineering and design alternatives with probable cost estimates for the project. The trail will complete the riverfront trail network connecting all of Red Wing's riverfront parks and historic downtown to a regional trail system (Goodhue Pioneer State Trail and the Cannon Valley Trail).

Over the years, public and private time, effort, and resources have been applied to reviewing the project feasibility and developing plans for a continuous riverfront trail that would link Red Wing's historic downtown to a series of riverfront parks and regional trails. For instance, to initiate the planning process the Red Wing Area Fund, a local philanthropic foundation, contributed over $100,000 towards the preliminary design.

The City's Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Action Plan, and Riverfront Redevelopment Plan provide the vision to establish downtown Red Wing as a premier historic river-town and enhance the city's status as a regional center and hub of economic activity.

One of the key transportation goals of the city is to create a multi-modal transportation network that places high priority on environmentally sustainable and health conscious modes of transportation. The Mississippi River riverfront is a prime attraction and plays an important role in the region's tourism and economic development. Connecting regional trail systems and Red Wing's riverfront parks to the City's historic downtown is a critical step to enhancing economic activity, tourism, and providing active living recreational opportunities for the region.

In addition to becoming a future segment of the broader Mississippi River Trail (MRT) system, the trail development will also contribute to a vital network of bike lanes and sidewalks connecting Red Wing neighborhoods to recreational areas, the riverfront, and downtown. The completion of the River Walk Trail; when combined with the improvements completed, in progress, and planned for Red

Wing's River Town Renaissance; and the future new Mississippi River Interstate Bridge; will capture the essence and synergy contemplated within Red Wing's riverfront plans.

The proposed trail will also provide increased safety for pedestrians, bicycle enthusiasts, hikers, and commuters who currently use the existing unimproved path immediately abutting the Mississippi River and Canadian Pacific (CP) Rail lines. Currently, there is no safety fencing along the rail line which makes the use of the unimproved path next to the main CP rail lines extremely unsafe. Having the path next to the swift moving river's edge with no safeguards is also a concern.

The total length of the trail is approximately 2.5 miles. The Red Wing River Walk Trail will be developed as an exceptional high quality regional recreational destination. An estimated cost for the completion of trail, with ancillary facilities, is $11,502,823.

Minnesota's first nationally designated bike-way corridor (the MRT) passes thru Red Wing. As a bike-way priority and abutting the Great River Road, the trail project was recently awarded $480,000 in federal funds from Great River Road Scenic Byway program.

In addition, the project would be leveraged with over $2.5 million in local city funds scheduled within the city's CIP, Legacy Parks and Trails funding, and local private donations.

The higher than normal pedestrian trail costs are attributed to the need to accommodate CP Railroad's requirements for the trail alignment. CP Rail controls the right-of-way (ROW) to the Normal Water Elevation of the river along a 1,000 foot segment of the trial. Despite numerous ongoing discussions to resolve the issue, a section of the trail may be required to be elevated using a unique floating trail design along a 900-foot segment. As planned, the uniquely designed elevated and floating trail segment will place trail users in extraordinarily close contact with the Mississippi River and, overall, will enhance the trail as a regional destination.

In addition, a section of the trail alignment from Barn Bluff Park to Covill Park will be aligned between CP Rail's ROW and US TH 61. Based on preliminary engineering information, this segment will require above normal rock excavation, added retaining walls, and enhanced stormwater management systems that increase anticipated construction costs.

Project Rationale

The project is a continuation of the city's ongoing River Town Renaissance initiative to revitalize Red Wing's riverfront. As a regional trade center, Red Wing's economic development and area businesses rely on and benefit from tourism which is enhanced by providing recreational and active living opportunities in the region. In addition to the economic benefit, a riverfront pedestrian trail system will also provide the region with enhanced opportunities for multi-modal transportation.

Other Considerations

The city is requesting that any appropriation will not be subject to the match requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 16A.86 Subd. 4.

Further, the city requests that local funds expended to complete preliminary engineering and the environmental assessment for this project since January 1, 2008, shall count as a project funding match.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

The project is a continuation of Red Wing's ongoing River Town Renaissance initiative that will enhance regional economic activities, economic opportunities, improve public safety, boost public health and augment environmental protections. As a regional trade center Red Wing's, and area businesses, benefit from the enhanced economic activity and tourism provided by recreational and active living opportunities. The completed project will provide the public with new, unique recreational and intermodal transportation options abutting the Mississippi River. The completed project will provide a commuting transportation alternative to the public for employment and shopping purposes. The project will have an economic development impact and benefit for the community and the regional market area. The project will be completed for the benefit of the public and could only be reasonably undertaken by a public entity.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Finance Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Mississippi River Walk Trail and Trailhead

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$8,627	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$0	$480	$0	$0
City Funds	$50	$50	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$500	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$796	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$50**	**$11,453**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$50	$1,586	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$50	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$8,556	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,261	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$50**	**$11,453**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

West Red Wing Public Safety Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,600
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	The proposed project, construction of the Red Wing West Public Safety Facility, consists of two separate phases. Phase 1 of the project is pre-design and final design work. Phase 2 of the project is construction of the facility. $2.60 million is State funds are necessary for Phase 2 of the project to leverage a minimum of $2.60 million in local funding committed for Phases 1 and 2.

Project Description

The commercial, industrial, and residential development located in the Fire Department's western service region is outside of the ISO standard 5-mile limit for response time. While the permanent population of the Prairie Island Community and surrounding areas of the Fire Department's western service region do not meet urban population parameters, the daily transient population of the Tribal Community's Treasure Island Resort and Casino alone warrants an urban level of service delivery. The Resort and Casino draws patrons from a wide geographical area and is currently Goodhue County's largest employer.

Red Wing also has responsibility for fire and EMS response to Xcel Energy's Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant. The nuclear plant is located at the furthest terminus of response time from the current public safety building. The new Public Safety Facility would cut Fire and EMS response time to the facility by at least 50 percent. Failure to respond to an emergency at the facility in a timely manner could have significant regional consequences.

The facility will also include space for the Police Department. Currently, the only Police office presence is within the Goodhue County Justice Center located one city block from the main Public Safety Facility in downtown Red Wing. Having office space within the new facility will increase efficiency within the Police Department.

A completed demand analysis of current and projected Fire and EMS service highly recommended that a new facility be considered for western service region. The new facility would greatly improve response for the western boundary of the city and the adjoining regional service areas for fire protection, EMS and police response.

Phase 1 of the project has been initiated. The project will be shovel ready in late 2016. The city has budgeted and encumbered $363,000 in local funding for the professional services necessary for Phase 1 of the project. The city has expended $357,000 acquiring the facility site.

The city has entered into a contract for the feasibility study, preliminary design, and final design/construction administration for the facility.

Project Rationale

Red Wing's primary and only public safety facility has an approximate 20-minute response time for Fire and Emergency Medical Service (EMS) calls to the western boundaries of the Fire Department's regional service area. Included within the Fire Department's western service region are multiple commercial, industrial and residential areas of Red Wing, the Prairie Island Tribal Community, and three adjoining Townships. In addition, important regional and national facilities and critical infrastructure are within this area. Providing a reasonable response time for emergency services to the citizenry and critical regional infrastructure is a priority of the city.

Other Considerations

The proposed public safety facility will considerably improve emergency service response to several important regional and nationally significant facilities including: the Treasure Island Resort & Casino, Xcel Energy's Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, and the US Army Corps of Engineers Lock and Dam Number 3.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red wing

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

The construction of a Public Safety Facility will be completed for the benefit, safety and welfare of the public. The project could only be reasonably undertaken by a public entity.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Finance Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

($ in thousands)

West Red Wing Public Safety Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,600	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$377	$2,223	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$377**	**$4,823**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$357	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$20	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$287	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,148	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$384	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$4	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$377**	**$4,823**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Highway Rail Grade Separation at Sturgeon Lake Road

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$14,762
Priority Ranking:	4
Project Summary:	$14.642 million in State funds are needed and requested to fund the Sturgeon Lake Road railroad grade separation project. The project will construct a new grade separation bridge crossing for Sturgeon Lake Road over the Canadian Pacific Railroad main line.

Project Description

Sturgeon Lake Road is the only public access to Tribal Lands of the Prairie Island Indian Community (PIIC), Xcel Energy's Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, and the US Army Corps of Engineers Lock & Dam Number 3.

The scope of the project includes: construction of a new grade separation crossing of Sturgeon Lake Road over the Canadian Pacific Railroad on Sturgeon Lake Road, roadway realignment, bike and pedestrian facilities, and aesthetic enhancements. The project begins 500 feet west of Xcel Road and continues east for approximately 0.8 miles along Sturgeon Lake Road to the intersection of Wiobata Street. A new trail connection will be provided beside Island Boulevard to the Prairie Island Indian Community's Health Clinic and Fitness Center.

Planning for the project was initiated in 2004 after receipt of federal funding for preliminary engineering planning and environmental work for the project in the fall of 2003. In June of 2006 an environmental FONSI was determined and a Level 2 geometric layout was completed. At that point the project stalled.

In late 2010, a MOA was signed between the City of Red Wing and the PIIC and agreed to by MnDOT to resurrect the project. Due to several changes within and abutting the project area and footprint, the environmental review and Level 2 geometric layout required revisions and updating prior to final design.

After an RFQ solicitation in mid-2011 the city contracted with a consulting engineering firm to prepare final environmental and design documents. The project environmental review is complete and the project is 100 percent designed and shovel-ready.

The construction budget is $14,163,744, ROW acquisition is estimated at $150,000, and the construction contingency is budgeted at $716,687. Engineering, environmental, inspection, and project management costs are budgeted at $2,993,569. The total project cost is estimated at $18,024,017.

Red Wing was the grateful recipient of two federal awards in 2003, $2.0 million and $700,000 respectively, for the environmental review and design work for the project. The federal awards were specifically designated for preliminary and final environmental review and engineering design. $1,719,586 of the federal funding has been obligated for the environmental and preliminary and final project design.

Other key funding sources anticipated for the project include $250,000 from CP Railway and additional budget authority from the city and tribal council.

Project Rationale

Railroad grade separation from crossing vehicular traffic has long been identified nationally and by the state as a priority transportation life-safety enhancement. After several high profile railroad grade crossing and crude oil tanker accidents and with the onset of increased Bakken crude oil transport by rail, Minnesota lawmakers mandated a study of railroad grade crossings and rail safety in 2014. The completed MnDOT study identified the Sturgeon Lake Road railroad grade crossing as a priority railroad grade separation project.

Other Considerations

The Sturgeon Lake Road Railroad Grade Separation project has been identified by MnDOT and Governor Dayton as a high priority rail grade separation project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will operate the facility?

City of Red Wing

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

The project is the construction of a public roadway bridge that will provide a railroad grade crossing safety enhancement and ensure access to and egress from the Prairie Island Indian Community, the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant and the US Army Corps of Engineers Lock & Dam Number 3. The project will be completed for the benefit of the public and could only be undertaken by a public entity.

Description of Previous Appropriations

N/A

Project Contact Person

Marshall Hallock
Finance Director
651-385-3602
marshall.hallock@ci.red-wing.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Highway Rail Grade Separation at Sturgeon Lake Road

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$14,762	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Federal Funds	$1,720	$0	$0	$0
City Funds	$40	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$980	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$272	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$250	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,760**	**$16,264**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$150	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$1,720	$1,235	$0	$0
Project Management	$40	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$14,879	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,760**	**$16,264**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Redwood Falls, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Lake Redwood Reclamation and Enhancement Project	1	GO	$ 7,800	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 7,800	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 7,800	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Lake Redwood Reclamation and Enhancement Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount: $7,800

Priority Ranking: 1

Project Summary: The main objective of this project is to remove up to 650,000 cubic yards of sediment increasing the current average depth of 2.8 feet to its original maximum depth of 20 feet. The $8,700,000.00 bond request is being matched with over $3,000,000.00 in hydroelectric upgrades by the City of Redwood Falls, $900,000.00 of cash match and implemented conservation efforts throughout the watershed. RCRCA a watershed based JPO and partners have implemented over $9,000,000.00 of BMPs, water quality monitoring and educational programming since 1994 reducing sedimentation by over 27,276 tons per year. As with any river based reservoir, sedimentation will continue at the reduced rate of 0.13 feet per year, by trapping 16,500 tons annually from reaching the Minnesota River, the Mississippi River and eventually Lake Pepin. The life expectancy of the project is beyond 70 years. Lake Redwood is one of two remaining lakes located in Redwood County and both are man made reservoirs.

Project Description

The Redwood-Cottonwood Rivers Control Area (RCRCA), a multi-county joint powers organization in conjunction with the City of Redwood Falls, proposes to reclaim Lake Redwood by dredging accumulated sediments. Lake Redwood is a man–made impoundment located at the downstream end of 629-square mile drainage area with predominantly agriculture land uses. Lake Redwood was originally formed in 1902 when the Redwood River was impounded by A.C. Burmiester who was quoted in the May 9, 1900 edition of the Redwood Gazette: “The idea is to dam the river at a point 100 feet south of the bridge… It is to be built high enough to flood all of the land that is to be purchased, and hence will form a beautiful lake, which is to be stocked with fish, and which can be used for boating, bathing and other purposes…”. The current dam, which is over thirty feet high, was refurbished after the flood of record in 1957. Abundant recreational opportunities were provided by this reservoir and local citizens actively used the lake. The dam also provides a source of electricity to the city of Redwood Falls. The current hydropower facility has a capacity of 0.6 megawatts which is used to provide summertime peak demand reduction. The City of Redwood Falls upgraded the hydroelectric turbine in 2012 to increase the green energy the dam provides which cost in excess of $3 million dollars that was earmarked for the bonding submission in 2012.

RCRCA was established in 1983 to reduce the amount of sediment from reaching Lake Redwood by implementing conservation practices up stream. RCRCA is made up of an eight county joint powers organization that includes the County Boards and County Soil and Water Conservation Districts. At the time, Lake Redwood’s sedimentation rate was about 1.5 feet a year being deposited and not conducive or cost effective for dredging. Since that time numerous conservation projects have been implemented and those projects have reduced the sedimentation rate to .13 feet per year. With

conservation practices actively being adopted in the watershed this can go even lower resulting in a project with well over a 70 year life expectancy. Recent sediment coring data presented by the MN Geological Survey have shown results that more than 70 percent of the current loading is coming from in stream streambank erosion caused by increased hydraulic loading. Increased wetland restoration efforts that are underway with BWSR, SWCDs and funding from the Outdoor Heritage Fund will further reduce the excessive hydraulic loading and subsequently reduce the effects of stream bank and bed-load erosion further extending the life of this project.

The MNDNR conducted a resurvey on the Redwood Reservoir in 2006 to monitor the physical, chemical and biological characteristics of the basin. The deepest water found was 7.3 feet, but most of the reservoir was 4.5 feet or less with a 2.8 foot average. Several shallow areas made boating difficult during the early August time period. The reservoir's watershed was dominated by row crop agriculture and the most abundant shallow water substrate was silt. Submergent vegetation was extremely rare and the water was highly turbid. The Redwood reservoir has suffered from partial winterkills in the past but none have been documented in recent years.

A variety of species were available to anglers fishing the Redwood Reservoir in 2006. High numbers of channel catfish were trap netted. Channel catfish were 7.3-23.5 inches long averaging 13.8 inches. The 2006 catch rate for channel catfish was 14 times greater than any previous catch rate. Low numbers of northern pike, walleye, and black crappie were trap netted in 2006. Pike were 21.9-25.0 inches long averaging 23.4 inches. Walleye were large, ranging in length from 23.3-24.3 inches. Black crappie were also keeper sized, ranging in length from 8.2-11.5 inches. Carp, golden red horse, silver red horse, bigmouth buffalo and white sucker should also provide plenty of action for reservoir anglers.

Along with restoring the fishery in Lake Redwood, this project has an additional water quality benefit. It is a proven fact that the residence time of the lake brings the fecal coliform level downstream under the 200 colony forming units per 100 ml threshold. This project by reclaiming the reservoir capacity will increase residence time and add further UV and deposition treatment prior to discharging to the Minnesota River. Currently, a Turbidity TMDL is underway for the Redwood River. Again, the Lake will have a 70 year plus life expectancy. By removing 650,000 cubic yards of sediment, the reservoir will eventually trap that volume again and keep the stored sediment from degrading the MN River basin and complement the efforts in Lake Pepin. The sediment delivery to the lake has gone from 1.5 feet per year to .13 feet reflecting the enormous amount of conservation projects that have gone in upstream. With added attention to non-point runoff and streambank stabilization as reflected in the sediment coring data by Carrie Jennings of the MN Geological Survey, we will be able to extend the life well beyond 70 years. With the Governors new buffer initiative on the Redwood River and drainage ditches, the outcomes will most definitely enhance the longevity of this dredging proposal. Additional work will need to be done to identify areas that will benefit from a buffer strip that will minimize use along the river and ditches that will ultimately reduce the amount of sediment reaching Lake Redwood.

The current status of the project is pending securing additional project dollars. This project has been designed, completed an EAW and currently has all of the permits required to start this fall. The project went out for bids and they came in at 5.2 million. The project could commence as early as July of 2016 for sediment basin construction with the actual hydraulic dredging to begin spring of 2017.

The primary work area of the Lake Redwood Reclamation and Enhancement Project will be in the Redwood Falls City Limits and the dewatering pond will be in Delhi Township of Redwood County.

This Project is directly consistent with the uses of the Outdoor Heritage Fund, as specified in Article

XI of the Minnesota Constitution and Minnesota Statute 97A.056: to restore, protect, and enhance wetlands, prairies, forests, and habitat for fish, game, and wildlife. Furthermore, it will produce multiple conservation benefits across a large targeted and planned geographic area.

Project Rationale

RCRCA Joint Powers Organization formed by statue in 1983 undertook the goal of reducing the sedimentation rates to Lake Redwood in order to make this project feasible. The RCRCA Joint Powers organization consists of eight Counties and the associated eight Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Six of those Counties: Lincoln, Lyon, Murray, Pipestone, Redwood and Yellow Medicine have been actively engaged through the Joint Powers Organization in establishing targeted conservation practices in the Redwood River Watershed. Of course this has all been made possible by the tremendous support and adoption of these conservation practices by local landowners. These efforts will continue concurrently with the project and beyond to increase its sustainability. This project also has the benefit of being shovel ready with the engineering, the EAW has already been completed, permits that have expired will be renewed upon funding notification.

RCRCA has been monitoring the Redwood River through the MNPCA Clean Water Partnership Program since 1989. Of which, 26 years of water quality data has been collected and pollutant loading has been calculated using the US Army Corp. of Engineers FLUX modeling program. Lake sediment depth has been manually measured in 1991, 2002 and sediment coring with radioactive isotope dating has been performed in 2007 by the MN Geological Survey. All water quality data has been submitted and is stored on the EPA STORET database for public use and has been certified. The data has been used to calculate loading characteristics coming in and going out of Lake Redwood and is the foundation for trend analysis for all statistics that have been quoted. RCRCA and its SWCD JPO members have implemented as of 2007: 298 BMPs under 173 contracts that reduce soil loss by 25 tons per year resulting in 18 tons per year reduction in sedimentation and 20 thousand pounds per year of phosphorus. RCRCA partners have implemented 7,336.36 acres of CREP/RIM and NRCS have treated 4,132 acres in the Redwood River watershed resulting in 16.5 tons of sediment reduction annually and 23,000 pounds of phosphorus from annually reaching the Redwood River and subsequently Lake Redwood. These activities are what have lead to the reduction in sedimentation rates from 1.5 feet per year to the current .13 feet annually. On-going conservation efforts will undoubtedly reduce the rate even further. All modeling, sediment coring and conservation implementation results are available upon request in MS Word, Excel and PowerPoint formats. Engineering for the project is also available electronically.

Other Considerations

The Lake Redwood Reclamation Project is engineered and is construction ready. A full EAW has been performed and all of the permits necessary for construction have been obtained. With a successful funding award, it will be used in conjunction with the City of Redwood Falls “Green Energy” hydro turbine and facility upgrade and local match dollars to complete the project and meet the project objectives. A fee title acquisition may be negotiated to leave the dewatering basin intact for future maintenance dredging determined by a scheduled 35 year maintenance inspection.

The recent Governor's buffer initiative will enhance the longevity of the project. Additional work will need to be done to quantify eligible areas along the Redwood River and contributing drainage ditches that will benefit from a buffer area which will ultimately result in limited use which will reduce the amount of sediment from reaching Lake Redwood.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No new or additional state operating dollars are anticipated to be requested if the proposal is funded in full.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Redwood Falls will own and maintain the dewatering property acquired in fee-title through the project.

Who will operate the facility?

The Redwood Cottonwood Rivers Control Area (RCRCA) would receive the appropriated funding from the appointed funding agency and carry out the project. RCRCA was originally created to develop a feasibility study in 1983 and has worked with MPCA and partners to implement BMPs that have successfully reduced sedimentation rates making the project feasible. It is appropriate that RCRCA conducts the project to accomplish what it set out to do 32 years ago.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The dewatering site will remain active for six years after the reclamation has been completed to dry out the material to facilitate the continuance of row crop farming to harvest and remove nitrogen and phosphorus contained in the sediment as a best management practice. The containment berms would be left in place and seeded to permanent vegetative cover enabling future use for any needed maintenance sediment removal. Row crop leases will be managed by the City of Redwood Falls.

Public Purpose

Purpose of this project proposal is to: 1. Enhance and increase an alternative energy resource through hydroelectric power generation. 2. Capture and treat pollutants that will help treat TMDL impairments in the Redwood and Minnesota Rivers 3. Reclaim and enhance recreational opportunities in one of the two public lakes in Redwood County- both man made.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Keith Muetzel
City Administrator
507-637-5755
kmuetzel@ci.redwood-falls.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Lake Redwood Reclamation and Enhancement Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$7,800	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$3,000	$900	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$3,000**	**$8,700**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,105	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$925	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$50	$0	$0
Construction	$3,000	$6,620	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$3,000**	**$8,700**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Rochester, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Rochester International Airport Customs and Border Patrol Improvements and Other Airport Improvements	1	GO	$ 4,985	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,985	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,985	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Rochester International Airport Customs and Border Patrol Improvements and Other Airport Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,985
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Design, Construct, Renovate and Improve the Rochester International Airport to meet the requirements of the US Dept. of Homeland Security for continued Customs and Border Patrol operations and other facility improvements to enable the Rochester International Airport to accommodate international flights. The improvements would include relocation of airline ticket counters to utilize existing footprint for Federal Inspection.

Project Description

To retain an "international airport designation", the Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) is requiring replacement of existing customs facilities as soon as possible because it does not meet Department of Homeland Security (DHS) standards for safety, security, or processing time for the types of international flights that occur in Rochester. The DHS requires new General Aviation Facility (GAF) and Federal Inspection Services (FIS) facilities at the Rochester International Airport (RST) passenger terminal. These facilities are essential to the long term viability of the airport and region as they allow the airport to accommodate international flights, and to increase the overall CBS processing capacity to 75 passengers per flight. Based on current GAF and FIS design guidelines, additional floor area will be required to accommodate all the facilities needed. It is anticipated that a FIS of approximately 20,000 square feet will be required to accommodate these passenger processing requirements. Additionally upgrades to the mechanical, electrical, fire protection, and low voltage network will also be needed and included in the work. To accommodate the GAF and FIS spatial requirements and to improve the passenger experience several existing spaces within the terminal will be reconfigured or relocated affecting: ticketing, baggage screening, inbound/outbound baggage, vertical circulation, Airline Ticketing Offices, abandoned concession space, baggage claim and restrooms in the secure area. The proposed terminal changes will help the Rochester International Airport in several ways. It will result in better utilization of existing terminal space, increase CBP facility capacity in processing international passengers to meet existing demand, replace portions of facility terminal infrastructure with more reliable, efficient and code compliant building systems, and generate a positive and safer experience for travelers using the terminal. The total budgeted cost for design and construction of the facility is anticipated to be $10,500,000 the breakdown of costs will be $2,740,000 (Federal Aviation Administration), $2,775,000 (City of Rochester), and $4,985,000 (State Bonding).

Project Rationale

To enable the Rochester International Airport to continue to provide customs and border patrol services and thereby accommodate direct international flights, facility improvements are required by

the Department of Homeland Security to the federal inspection facilities and the general aviation facilities. Continuation of international flights are critical to the airport operations and to provide international travelers with convenient and timely access to the SE region and particularly to the medical facilities in Rochester.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Rochester Airport Customs and Border Patrol Project will have no impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

The City of Rochester owns the airport.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Rochester has a contract with the Rochester Airport Company, a Mayo Clinic affiliate, to operate the airport.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The overall Airport facilities will be owned and operated by the City of Rochester. The federal Customs and Border Patrol will occupy and operate the customs and border patrol areas. There are also private entity users in the Airport that include: Delta and American Airlines, several car rental companies, and a contracted private restaurant operation.

Public Purpose

The public purpose is to improve the Rochester International Airport as a critical transportation facility for SE Minnesota by making required Customs and Border Patrol improvements for international flights and visitors.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous State Bonding Requests from the City for the Rochester International Airport. The City and the Airport annually have worked with MNDOT Aeronautics on projects at the Rochester Airport.

Project Contact Person

Gary Neumann
Assistant City Administrator
507-328-2000
gneumann@rochestermn.gov

($ in thousands)

Rochester International Airport Customs and Border Patrol Improvements and Other Airport Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$4,985	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$1,129	$2,775	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$2,740	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,129**	**$10,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$115	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$1,014	$500	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$8,344	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$300	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,356	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,129**	**$10,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Rockville, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Rocori Trail Phase 2	1	GO	$ 1,495	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 1,495	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 1,495	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Rocori Trail Phase 2

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,495
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$1,494,910 in state funds is requested to acquire, predesign, design, and construct phase 2 of the Rocori Trail, located in the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring and Rockville, Minnesota.

Project Description

Estimated Project Costs for Phase 2 of the Rocori Trail:

$1,828,610	Construction
$182,861	Construction Contingency
$475,439	Engineering/Legal/Admin
$200,000	Right of Way
$2,686,910	TOTAL

$920,000 was received for Phase 2 last year, and the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring, and Rockville and Stearns County pledged a total of $272,000.

Project Rationale

This application's request is for design and construction of Phase 2 of the Rocori Trail. Once completed, the trail will connect the cities of Richmond, Cold Spring, and Rockville. Phase 1, which starts at 178th Avenue in Richmond and ends near the eastern city limits of Cold Spring, received grants from SAFETEA-LU, DNR Local Trails, and Legacy Trails for construction of the trail, which was completed in November 2012. Phase 2 – this application – will start where Phase 1 left off, near the eastern city limits of Cold Spring, and end in downtown Rockville.

The connections of the three cities – Richmond, Cold Spring, and Rockville – and the fact that it will connect to the State Glacial Lakes State Trail at Richmond, makes the Rocori Trail a destination for recreational users and will be a tourist draw, providing for economic benefit from outside the local area. The Glacial Lakes Trail runs from Willmar to Richmond, the DNR is currently working on the Richmond segment. When the DNR segment is done at the end of this year, Rocori Trail will be connected to the Glacial Lakes State Trail. With Phase 2 of the Rocori Trail complete, users will be able to bike / walk from Rockville to Willmar. Additionally, Stearns County has plans to connect to the Rocori Trail and travel east into the St. Cloud area. Connections could then easily be made to both the Lake Wobegon and Beaver Island Trails. Furthermore, Stearns County has talked about connecting the Beaver Island Trail to Warner Lake Park. The City of Clearwater in Wright County has plans to connect its trail to Warner Lake Park. This would bring more than 100 miles of trail connectivity. This proposed trail project is significant to that vision.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The three cities have maintained phase 1 and will do the same for phase 2 of the Rocori Trail, realizing costs will increase but will be economies of scale.

Who will own the facility?

Rocori Trail Construction Board

Who will operate the facility?

Rocori Trail Construction Board

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

Provide increased and enhanced outdoor recreational opportunities for citizens of all abilities, along with an alternative mode of transportation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Two separate bonding bill awards were received for Phase 1 in the amounts of $372,000 and $800,000.

Project Contact Person

Rena Weber
City Administrator
320-251-5836
rweber@rockvillecity.org

($ in thousands)

Rocori Trail Phase 2

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,495	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$180	$0	$0
County Funds	$0	$92	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,767**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$200	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$475	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$915	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$177	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,767**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Roseau, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Roseau Fire Station Expansion	1	GO	$ 700	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 700	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 700	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Roseau Fire Station Expansion

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$700
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$700,000 in state funds is requested to design, construct, furnish and equip a 4,200 SF addition to the Roseau Fire Station located in the City of Roseau, in Roseau County for the purpose of housing essential emergency response equipment to meet the growing emergency response needs of the people and assets of Northwest Minnesota.

Project Description

The proposed project involves the final design, bidding and construction of a 4,200 SF pre-cast concrete addition to the existing 6,912 SF pre-cast concrete fire station. The existing Roseau Fire Station consists of a large vehicle storage garage with five (5) vehicle storage bays and approximately 1,400 SF of inhabited office, meeting and support space. City consultant, Johnson Laffen Architects, assessed all of the City's buildings and found that the existing fire station was in excellent physical condition and in the proper location for its mission. However, the building was found to be lacking in space and in need of minor upgrades to some of the aging mechanical and HVAC systems. As a result of this assessment, the City's comprehensive plan included a long-range study of the on-going space needs of the fire station. In 2013, the city hired consultant, Widseth, Smith, Nolting (WSN), to review the specific space needs of the fire department. The preliminary study resulted in a need for approximately 4,000 SF of additional space to house all of the existing equipment plus providing expansion for the possible addition of a ladder truck to the department's fleet to address taller structures within the department's service territory. WSN has further refined the proposed fire station addition design to consist of three (3) new vehicle storage bays, two bays similar to the existing fire station bays, and a third drive-through bay of sufficient size to accommodate a future addition of a ladder truck when needed. Additional space behind the vehicle storage bays will accommodate the department's air compressor and air tank filling room. The fire station addition would match the original fire station in construction utilizing pre-cast tilt-up double tee concrete panels, concrete floor and a built-up rubber roofing system. The project will also involve work to the existing fire station in the areas of mechanical, HVAC and lighting to upgrade the systems and improve energy efficiency. The addition and renovations to the Roseau Fire Station will be completed with longevity and durability at the heart of the design intent. The goal is to provide a building that serves the community well into the future. As part of a state-funded project, it is our goal to comply with all of the requirements of the Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines; including the Building, Benchmarks, and Beyond; and SB2030 requirements. The total cost of the project is $1,400,000 with the City of Roseau committing $700,000 in general fund dollars to the project. The project is expected to take less than one (1) year to complete.

Project Rationale

This expansion project is necessary due to the increasing service demands on the Roseau Fire Department. In recent years, the department has added more specialized firefighting and emergency

response equipment to meet the department's on-going mission. The existing fire station was constructed in 1988, and at that time the fire station housed only four (4) emergency response vehicles in the five-bay structure. In the late 1980's, the Roseau Fire Department's primary mission was to respond to structural fires and small grass fires in and around the City of Roseau and the fire station's design was such that it adequately served that mission with some room for expansion. However, since 1988 the mission of the Roseau Fire Department has dramatically expanded to include more services such as: forest and wildfire support, search and rescue, accident and hazardous spill response, disaster response and mobile incident command. Each of these new missions have brought with it additional specialized equipment that needs to be housed in such a way that it is accessible and in working order at a moment's notice. For example, one-half of the Roseau Fire Department's assets are dedicated to forest and wildfire suppression equipment in support of the MN DNR's mission to protect the vast amount of state forest in the Roseau Fire Department's service territory. Unfortunately, the current facility does not provide sufficient space to house all of this equipment, and today vital emergency response equipment is now sitting outside exposed to the elements, snow and vandalism, possibly rendering it unusable at a time of emergency. The Roseau Fire Department currently maintains nine (9) vehicles and large pieces of equipment that it must attempt to house in a fire station only designed to accommodate five (5). The proposed 4,200 SF addition to the existing fire station would provide three (3) additional vehicle storage bays and additional equipment storage areas to adequately house the existing equipment and make it easily accessible in the case of emergency when every second counts.

Other Considerations

The Roseau Fire Department was an early leader in the consolidation of area rural fire departments into the city's coverage to improve the capabilities of the emergency response team. Today the Roseau Fire Department has a service territory that covers the City of Roseau and 19 surrounding townships in Roseau County as well as some unorganized portions of Roseau County. The service area of the Roseau Fire Department spans over 960 square miles of the State of Minnesota (equivalent to 2/3 of the State of Rhode Island) and contains over 240 square miles of County, State, Federal and Tribal lands including: Beltrami Island State Forest, Lost River State Forest, Palmville WMA, Roseau Lake WMA, and Hayes Lake State Park. Increasingly the Roseau Fire Department has become a vital participant in the control and suppression of wildfires and forest fires on our state lands. For example, in April of 2015, the Roseau Fire Department provided invaluable front line support to the MnDNR Forestry teams fighting the Palsburg Forest Fire in Beltrami Island State Forest. Without the support of the Roseau Fire Department additional state forest resources would have been lost. Additionally the Roseau Fire Department provides first-responder services to over 80 miles of state highways within its service territory. The equipment necessary to maintain readiness for the multitude of emergency response situations has driven the need for additional space in the Roseau Fire Station.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None.

Who will own the facility?

City of Roseau

Who will operate the facility?

City of Roseau

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Roseau Fire Department will be the sole occupant of the building

Public Purpose

The project serves to house the equipment of the Roseau Fire Department who provides emergency services to the public within a large geographic region in Northwestern Minnesota. The Roseau Fire Department provides a multitude of services including fire fighting, search & rescue, emergency management response, hazardous materials spills response, accident response, and incident command among other emergency services to the general public.

Description of Previous Appropriations

2013 - $3,500 Preliminary Project Design (City of Roseau)

2014 - $18,000 Project Design (City of Roseau)

2015 - $2,000 Project Design (City of Roseau)

Project Contact Person

Todd Peterson
Community Development Coordinator
218-463-5003
tpetersn@mncable.net

($ in thousands)

Roseau Fire Station Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$700	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$24	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$700	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$24**	**$1,400**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$4	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$20	$35	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$20	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,317	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$20	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$8	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$24**	**$1,400**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
US169/TH41/CSAH78 Interchange & Frontage Roads	1	GO	$ 2,500	$ 0	$ 0
CSAH 14 Overpass and Frontage Roads	2	GO	$ 7,500	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 10,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 10,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

US169/TH41/CSAH78 Interchange & Frontage Roads

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$2.5 million in state bond funds is requested for design, right of way acquisition and, construction for local frontage roads to support a programmed interchange at the intersection of United States (US) Highway 169 and Minnesota Trunk Highway (TH) 41 and County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 78 southwest of the City of Shakopee in Jackson Township."

Project Description

The proposed project is to construct frontage roads that support an interchange at the intersection of US 169 and TH 41/CSAH 78. Project components include frontage roads and direct access modifications that accompany the existing signalized intersection reconstruction into a grade separated freeway interchange.

US 169 is a four lane divided expressway. It is a Principal Arterial and interregional corridor that serves a key freight connection between Southern Minnesota including Mankato to the Twin Cities, including the Ports of Savage. TH 41 is a major Minnesota River crossing that provides a transportation and economic connection to the City of Chaska, Carver County, and beyond. Frontage roads are needed to provide access for the local businesses that will not be able to pull on/off or across US 169 efficiently or safely.

The total cost of the interchange, including design and right-of-way, is estimated at $31 million. The associated frontage roads are estimated to cost $7.11 million. The interchange project received 7.5 million in federal STP funding. Construction of the project is anticipated to be complete in 2019 and is a partnership between the County, MnDOT, and both Jackson Township and Louisville Township.

Project Rationale

US 169 and TH 41 are both part of the National Highway System. This US 169 intersection currently provides critical access to the existing TH 41 Principal Arterial major river crossing into Carver County.

Reconstruction of the TH 41/CSAH 78 and US169 intersection as an interchange in 2018 will remove the existing traffic signal and direct access to correct existing safety and congestion issues and eliminate the freight bottleneck along the US 169 corridor. Construction of an interchange will improve the safety and reduce delays on the corridor by removing the at grade signalized intersection that becomes congested. Frontage roads are needed to support the existing businesses and remove at-grade accesses to US 169. Projected growth along the US 169 corridor will only increase delays to commerce without funding.

Other Considerations

Safety: The US 169/TH 41 intersection experiences the most crashes of all intersections in Scott County. The intersection ranked 78th of the top 200 intersections statewide for crash-cost 2011-2013, and has consistently ranked in the top 200 over the past decade (source: MnDOT Crash Data Toolkit prepared annually by the Office of Traffic, Safety and Technology). An interchange project at US 169/TH 41 is identified in the MnDOT Metro District Congestion Management Safety Plan (CMSP) Phase III as a candidate to maximize mobility and reduce crash risk at key congestion and safety problem locations. The interchange was identified as having a positive return on investment.

Freight Mobility: US 169 serves a key freight connection between agricultural rich land in southwestern Minnesota to the Twin Cities, including the Ports of Savage. Ninety percent of the grain arrives by truck to the Ports of Savage, a nationally prominent port for the shipment of grain and other commodities to the rest of the world. Three million tons of material is shipped through the Ports of Savage, which is six percent of all inland grain traffic originating in the United States.

With the conversion of the intersection at TH 41 and US 169 to an interchange, the major freight businesses with direct access to US 169 in the area will no longer be able to find gaps to pull onto or cross US 169. A traffic analysis of these access points see Level of Service for this access points failing operationally.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The Townships will be responsible for operating costs for the new lane miles of frontage roads. The County is adding some turn lane width to CSAH 78, and will be responsible for future operating costs associated with the interchange. MnDOT will be responsible for new ramps and bridges associated with the interchange construction.

Who will own the facility?

Scott County will own CH 78, and both Jackson and Louisville Township will own their respective frontage roads. MnDOT will own the US 169 and MNTH 41 bridge, signals with the interchange.

Who will operate the facility?

Scott County will operate CH 78 and both Jackson and Louisville Township will maintained and operate their respective frontage roads. MnDOT will maintain and operate the US 169 and MNTH 41 bridge, signals with the interchange.

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

US 169 serves as the main transportation and economic lifeline between Mankato and Southwestern Minnesota to the Twin Cities and Ports of Savage. TH 41 is a major river crossing of the Minnesota

River that connects Scott County to Chaska and Carver County. County State Aid Highway 78 is also identified as future Principal Arterial Corridor and connects in the CSAH 42 which is the major east west Principal Arterial connecting the entire south metro area. The current at grade signalized intersection on a high speed expressway is a safety concern and bottleneck to the regional traffic and commerce that travels through the intersection. The frontage roads will provide access to existing and future businesses and residents around the interchange area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Scott County was awarded 7 million in federal funding (STP) in the spring of 2015 to construct an interchange at US 169 and TH 41.

Project Contact Person

Lisa Freese
Tranportation Planning Director
952-496-8363
lfreese@co.scott.mn.us

($ in thousands)

US169/TH41/CSAH78 Interchange & Frontage Roads

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$710	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$7,560	$0
County Funds	$723	$2,000	$10,977	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$10,000	$3,630	$0
TOTAL	**$723**	**$15,210**	**$22,167**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

CSAH 14 Overpass and Frontage Roads

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$7,500
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	The request is for $7.5 million in state bonding funds for design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction for an overpass of United States Highway (US) 169 and County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 14 and related frontage road and direct access closures in Louisville Township.

Project Description

US 169 is a four lane divided expressway. It is a Principal Arterial and interregional corridor that serves a key freight connection between Southern Minnesota, including Mankato to the Twin Cities

An overpass and frontage roads at US 169 and CSAH 14 will continue efforts to remove at grade full access intersections from the US 169 Corridor to improve safety and mobility. The frontage road system and overpass at CSAH 14 will eliminate exposure of slow moving industrial/mining vehicles and residents to an at-grade crossing of the high speed US 169 mainline. The project will provide a supporting road network that removes direct private access to US 169 and offers alternate routes and safer access to US 169 for truck traffic generated from adjacent mining and industrial uses

The total cost of the overpass, including right-of-way and design, is estimated at $15 million. The County's Transportation Sales Tax is anticipated to be a key funding source for the project

Project Rationale

US 169 is part of the National Highway System and main transportation and economic connection from southwest Minnesota to the Twin Cities The project is needed to remove the high speed at grade crossing of US 169 and improve safety of the US 169 corridor and address the heavy mining and industrial turning movements on the corridor.

As signals have been removed further to the north on the corridor and as traffic volumes grows, it is becoming more difficult to find adequate gaps at this intersection. The intersection was originally identified as a future interchange location in the 2003 Interregional Corridor Management Plan. This solution is a lower cost practical design solution for the corridor and will achieve the same safety and operational benefits for US 169 at a lower cost than the previously recommended full Interchange

Other Considerations

The project is identified and supported by the 169 Corridor Coalition, a multi- county collaborative of public and private entities working to improve the safety, efficiency and economic development along the US 169 corridor.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Who will own the facility?

Scott County and Louisville Township will own the frontage road system. Scott will own the overpass bridge.

Who will operate the facility?

Louisville Townships will be responsible for the new lane miles of frontage roads for operating costs. The County is adding lane mileage for CSAH 14 overpass, and will be responsible for future operating costs associated with the overpass. MnDOT will not have additional lane mileage with the CSAH 14 overpass project.

Who will use or occupy this space?

N/A

Public Purpose

US 169 is a rural expressway Principal arterial. CSAH 14 is an A-Minor arterial roadway in Scott County with a current at grade access to US 169.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Lisa Freese
Transportation Planning Director
952-496-8363
lfreese@co.scott.mn.us

($ in thousands)

CSAH 14 Overpass and Frontage Roads

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$7,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$100	$200	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$7,200	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$100**	**$14,900**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Silver Bay, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Silver Bay Black Beach Campground	1	GO	$ 1,708	$ 0	$ 0
Silver Bay Municipal Campground - Rec Center	2	GO	$ 1,174	$ 0	$ 0
Mary MacDonald Rehabilitation Project	3	GO	$ 675	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,557	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,557	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Silver Bay Black Beach Campground

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,708
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The City of Silver Bay is requesting $1,708,350 for the design and construction of a 63-mixed site municipal campground located on 14.5 acres of City owned property which is across the street from the new public beach on Lake Superior known as Black Beach Recreational Park. Black Beach Recreational Park is a reclaimed mining site with historical significance and uniqueness along the north shore of Lake Superior that the City has recently secured access to in October 2014.

Project Description

On October 27, 2014, for the first time in the history of Silver Bay, the City obtained legal access to approximately 31.6 acres with approximately 3500 feet of shoreline along the north shore of Lake Superior that has been owned by the mining company in Silver Bay. The City, in partnership with the Minnesota DNR, entered into a long-term Recreational Lease Agreement with Northshore Mining Company for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a public recreational beach without any monetary charge. According to the Lake County Assessor, the valuation of Parcel ID #22-9600-00201 is $982,100 for the 2015 assessment year, a sizable gift to the public from the private sector. The public beach area is now known as Black Beach Recreational Park.

Black Beach Recreational Park encompasses three beach areas - Peach Beach, Agate Beach, and the most historical and unique beach known as Black Beach. Each beach provides for different characteristics - Peach beach is known for the large bedrock that gives off a orange/peach hue; Agate beach is known for the loose rocks/agates similar to much of Lake Superior's shoreline; but Black Beach is known for the natural sediment transport of past taconite tailings into sand that gives a diamond-like sparkle with black hue. They are all simply beautiful, but there is nothing similar to Black Beach anywhere on Lake Superior. Since the public beach opened, May 22, 2015, many locals and tourists have flocked to this unique property and feel that a campground near this location is needed.

In previous years, the City discussed the development of a municipal campground but many felt that not having access to Lake Superior would likely be too difficult to attract tourists when compared to other campgrounds in the area having lake access. In addition, the costs to develop a campground solely with City funds would be too burdensome. Since then, the City has been developing its Comprehensive and Capital Plan and have engaged the public, focus groups, and steering committee members whom identified the development of a municipal campground as a high priority need. In addition, the City Council adopted Resolution 2015-#22 stating that the Silver Bay Black Beach Municipal Campground was priority #1 for the City. The City Council also engaged Compass Rose-Building Performance Specialists (CR-BPS, Inc.) to conceptually design a campground on 14.5 acres of City owned property located in the 110-acre Eco-Park located next to Black Beach Recreational Park and Hwy 61.

The proposed campground (Silver Bay Black Beach Campground) is a 63-mixed site development project to house tents, small campers, and larger RV's with electrical, water, and sewer amenities. In addition, the campground will include a walking trail to the Black Beach Recreational Site, playground, pavilion, wooded sites, lavatory vaults, shower/lavatory building, and a main office building that is designed to be "net zero" to house offices, community area with kitchen set up, showers/lavatories, laundry, and storage. The cost of the proposed campground/park area is $3,416,700 made up of the following ($2,256,600 for Campground Construction Costs + $178,000 land value secured by the City + $982,100 Northshore Mining Land value for public use) and the the City is requesting $1,708,350 in state funding to help offset engineering, site clearance, construction of buildings and campground sites, fixtures, and infrastructure improvements. The City expects to cover the remaining portion needed, but will hope to lower its exposure by engaging additional funding sources like IRRRB, Lake County, other private/public partners, and through in-kind services, if needed. The City reviewed other options including developing the campground in two phases; however, the majority of the costs ($1.9 million) are in phase 1, but the majority of the sites (36) needed to generate operating revenues are in phase 2. In addition, the cost to develop in two phases increased the costs by more than $35,000; therefore, the City felt it was best to develop the entire 63-sites in one development phase pending the ability to secure funding.

Although the property that has been leased from the Mining Company, they have restricted the use of the property to be public beach only and not allow for overnight stay. Northshore Mining is very support of the development of the municipal campground located adjacent to the public beach, especially since Black Beach is a safe harbor for kayakers on the Lake Superior Water Trail. The municipal campground will also serve a central place for those traveling the CJ Ramstad/Northshore State trail from Duluth to Grand Portage, the Gitchi Gami Bike Trail, or the Superior National Hiking Trails. Silver Bay also is a local central point as it is an hour from Grand Marais, an hour to Duluth, and an hour to the Range Cities making it accommodating for those visiting the area that desire to enjoy the State Parks like Gooseberry Falls, Split Rock Lighthouse, Tettegouche, or Temperance River.

The campground is also expected to help attract additional businesses into the 110 acre Eco-Park such as an outfitter, restaurants, retail, and specialty shops with a recreational flare. Some local businesses have already started expanding inventory for camping and recreational products. Outside the jobs needed for development of the project (contractors, electricians, plumbers, etc), the campground will also create new jobs, primarily full-time/seasonal to start. Eventually, we expect that ancillary business developing in the park will create additional jobs.

Project Rationale

The project is needed to develop a new revenue source for the city in an effort to lower taxes for parks and recreation, create new lodging options in Silver Bay and in an effort to meet the demand for campground sites along the north shore, to attract new tourism dollars for local businesses, to create jobs and business diversification, and to provide an educational experience related to the history of mining in Silver Bay.

Other Considerations

The City has secured $125,000 from IRRRB for Black Beach Recreational Park for improvements to be made to the reclamation of the mine land for public purpose. The funds are to be used to install fencing for boundary identification, new lavatory vaults, picnic tables, fire rings, trash receptacles, and for conceptual planning of a campground. This project is currently being completed.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Currently the City levies approximately $125,000 in general taxes to support Parks and Recreational Programs. The campground profits will be used to lower the general fund need in hopes that the Parks and Recreational Department will become more self sufficient. The impact on the City's operational budget would be significant as every $10,000 the city increases in its levy is equal to about a 1% increase.

Who will own the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will operate the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will use or occupy this space?

No private entity

Public Purpose

Municipal Campground with Public Beach Access to Lake Superior

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Lana Fralich
City Administrator
218-226-4408
lanaf@silverbay.com

($ in thousands)

Silver Bay Black Beach Campground

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,708	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$178	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$982	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$548	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,416**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,060	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$128	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,128	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$100	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$3,416**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Silver Bay Municipal Campground - Rec Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,174
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	The City is requesting $1,174,250 for the design and construction of a 42-mixed use municipal campground on city owned property located in the center of the community. The funds will also be used to remove an existing building and the construct a new multi-use public facility.

Project Description

The City has been working on ways to generate revenues (other than by increasing the tax levy or eliminating services to the taxpayers) to offset the changes in LGA, Taconite Production Tax revenues, and the negative impact on Silver Bay's tax capacity from changes to the market value homestead credits. Events like the Rocky Taconite Tournament, Bay Days, Lake Superior Salmon Classic, ATV parade, and other events in Silver Bay have either been eliminated or have lessened because tourists coming to those events cannot find enough lodging space, especially campground sites. During the summer months, city staff receive multiple calls daily from tourists who are looking for open campsites.

Silver Bay is located one hour north of Duluth, an hour south of Grand Marais, and an hour east of the Range Cities making it a prime and convenient area for tourists who want to be in close driving distances those areas while enjoying the outdoor recreational facilities that our community has to offer. Silver Bay is the only municipality along the shores of Lake Superior that does not have a municipal campground facility. With an estimated 9,000 cars passing through Silver Bay, in only makes economic sense to attract tourism dollars to our community.

The City's first priority campground is located by the Black Beach Recreational Park that was recently secured to provide legal public beach access; however, the City feels that additional camping sites would be beneficial to attract additional tourists, meet the demand for camping along the north shore, and provide for a different location for those wishing to be located within walking distance from the grocery store, banking, library, restaurants, churches, tennis courts, and recreational trails such as the ATV, hiking, and biking.

The proposed Silver Bay Rec Center Municipal Campground will boast 42 RV sites including four pass through sites as conceptually planned by S.E.H. Engineering. There are additional tent area sites that are expected to serve the public who are using the Gitchi-Gami Bike Trail or the Superior National Forest Hiking Trails. The existing multi-use recreational building that is currently used for the public to rent, will be torn down as the structure has shown significant signs of wearing and is not cost effective for rehabilitation. There will be a new 3200sqft. multi use facility built in this location. The campground and building design includes solar panels, geothermal ground source heat pump, high efficiency LED lighting, energy efficient construction using environmentally friendly materials. Every effort will be made to reduce waste and improve the sustainability of the facility and its surround environment.

The cost of construction is estimated at $2, 348,500 with 1/2 of the project costs ($1,174,250) requested of State Bonds. This cost includes an increase from the original design budget to accommodate inflation. The remaining portion of matching funds will be covered by the City of Silver Bay; however, the city will seek additional funds from agencies such as IRRRB, County, and other private/public sources to lower the financial burden to the city.

Project Rationale

The project is needed to develop a new revenue source for the city in an effort to lower taxes for parks and recreation, to create new lodging options in Silver Bay in an effort to meet the demand for campground sites along the north shore, to attract new tourism dollars for local businesses, and to create jobs and business diversification.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Currently, the City levies approximately $125,000 in general taxes to support Parks and Recreational Programs. The campground profits will be used to lower the general fund need in hopes that the Parks and Recreational Department will become more self sufficient. The impact on the City's operation budget would be significant as every $10,000 the city increases in its levy is equal to 1% increase.

Who will own the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will operate the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will use or occupy this space?

n/a

Public Purpose

Municipal Campground

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Lana Fralich

Administrator
218-226-4408
lanaf@silverbay.com

($ in thousands)

Silver Bay Municipal Campground - Rec Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,174	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$1,174	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,348**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$153	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$55	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,140	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,348**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	This will be a city owned and operated municipal campground project. There will be no Use Agreement, but I am not sure in answering items 3, 4, 5 at this time until further clarification.
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Mary MacDonald Rehabilitation Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$675
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	The City of Silver Bay is requesting $675,000 State Bond Funding to renovate the exterior envelope of the Mary MacDonald Business Center. Renovation would include full replacement (tear off and installation) of the roof and the tuck-pointing, installation, siding of the exterior walls to stop water leaking in from roof and walls.

Project Description

The City of Silver Bay obtained the Mary MacDonald school in 2005 from the Lake Superior School District. The 57,000 square foot facility that was built in the 1960's is fully occupied and rented to a mix of businesses including: Wilderness Family Naturals (certified organic food company), Lake County Human Service Center, Bay Area Vineyard Church, Heavy Duty Designs, a Pharmacy, and a Thrift Store. There are approximately 50+ employees that work at the Mary MacDonald facility, many public who visit daily for the services provided, and many elderly citizens who use the facility as a safe walking place.

The City has invested countless hours into operating and maintaining this facility. In addition, a large renovation project was completed in 2009 to bring the facility up to code for ADA compliance, a fire suppression system, some energy efficiency's (new windows, doors, and boiler), expansion of a loading dock, and the replacement of commercial doors in order to make commercial operations more efficient. Although these changes have made significant strides to improving the building, the threat of businesses leaving due to constant water leak problems is a reality.

The City has received a general engineering estimate from S.E.H. and a proposal from A.W. Kuettel and Sons to replace the roof. Both were approximately $850,000 and the exterior siding renovation was estimated to be $500,000. The roof is no longer repairable and would include tearoff, disposal, and installation of a new rubber roof. The exterior walls include repair/replacement of old brick, insulation, and siding. The renovations are imperative due to the constant water leaking into the building which is starting to cause health and safety issues, especially for the organic food company. If these repairs are not completed soon, the potential for the building to close is becoming more likely. This will result in the loss of good paying jobs and services to our community since we do not have other facilities for these businesses to move in to.

Further concern is the unknown liability that the City may face for not repairing the facility and damage that can happen to the tenant's property. The cost for damages may be higher than the cost for replacement. Tenants have shown past commitment by entering into longer term contracts but are concerned that if the building is not repaired that they may have to vacate.

The Mary MacDonald Business Center is currently being monitored through the MN B3 program. The renovations proposed will meet the new Version 2.2 requirements based upon Federal historical requirements and state bonding requirements. It is expected that the renovations will exceed the

state energy code by at least 30%, will focus on achieving the lowest possible costs, will improve energy costs by making the facility more energy efficient, and will improve the health and safety of the building for the businesses occupying the space and employees working in the facility. The building designs are planned to be environmentally friendly and since the exterior envelope is being renovated, an assessment of lifetime sustainability will be completed. The project is expected to considerably improve the energy efficiencies of the building in addition to improving the health and safety of the facility. Every effort will be made to reduce waste and improve the sustainability of the facility and its surrounding environment.

Project Rationale

The purpose of the project is retain over 50 employees who work at the Mary MacDonald Business Center including its largest tenant, Wilderness Family Naturals. The old 57,000 sq ft school the CIty acquired from the Lake Superior School Distrcit was converted to an incubator/business center. The property is considerably deteriorated and is in jeopardy of losing tenants to its constant water issue that makes concern for health and safety issues. Although the building is self sufficient, there is not enough funds to do the entire project on its own or incur additional debt expenses. In addition, rents are competitive.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There are currently no tax dollars put into the facility, but the impact on the operating budget will be significant. The facility does not have income to offset the expenditures and incur a debt payment that would support a $1,350,000 project. There are other capital needs of the facility as well and by not having to use reserves for this large project, we are able to use those funds to do other improvements to the building.

Who will own the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will operate the facility?

City of Silver Bay

Who will use or occupy this space?

The building is a mixed use occupancy rented by public organizations (Lake County Service Center & Bay Area Vineyard Church) and by private companies (Wilderness Family Naturals, Pharmacy, Heavy Duty Sewing, and Dilly Dally shop).

Public Purpose

The public purpose was to have an incubator building to house entrepreneurs, which this facility has done well. This facility has been able to help expand businesses and increase employment. The

occupancy of the facility is full.

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Lana Fralich
City Administrator
218-226-4408
lanaf@silverbay.com

($ in thousands)

Mary MacDonald Rehabilitation Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$675	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$675	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,350**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$100	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$50	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,200	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,350**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Silver Creek, Town of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Stewart River Subordinate Service District - Wastewater Collection and Treatment System	1	GO	$ 8,693	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 8,693	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 8,693	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Stewart River Subordinate Service District - Wastewater Collection and Treatment System

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,693
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	This request is for $8,692,500 in state bond funding to design, construct, furnish and equip a new wastewater collection and treatment facility located in the Town of Silver Creek and Stewart River Subordinate Service District (SRSSD) in Lake County for the purpose of protecting public health, safety, and waters of the state.

Project Description

The SRSSD service area is primarily located along Lake Superior's North Shore Highway 61, running from Two Harbors to the Silver Creek Cliff Tunnel. Upon completion of the project, 123 residential properties and four commercial establishments will benefit; not to mention the pristine waters of Lake Superior.

The project would include the construction of a communal grinder pump sanitary sewer pressure collection system conveying wastewater to an aerobic treatment system with ultimate dispersal of highly pretreated effluent to the soil for groundwater recharge. The total cost of the project is estimated at $17,385,000.

The Town of Silver Creek will be assessing the end-user and obtaining loan funding. In addition, and in order to make the project affordable to the end-user, the Town is pursuing financial assistance from following funding sources:

- State of Minnesota Capital Appropriation Bonding
- Iron Range Resources and Rehabilitation Board
- Point Source Implementation Grant Program
- Green Project Reserve
- Wastewater Infrastructure Fund
- Clean Water Revolving Fund
- USDA Rural Development

Project Rationale

The project would address wastewater treatment issues that are a result of aged and failing septic systems within a select service area of the SRSSD. An evaluation of septic systems serving residents and businesses in the service area revealed 36% fail to protect groundwater, 14% are an imminent threat to public health and safety, and many that would be considered complaint, are

holding tank type systems that greatly minimize property value. The failing systems threaten the water quality of Lake Superior and the health and safety of residents. Challenging site conditions prevail throughout the project area including restrictive and slowly permeable soils, bedrock, small residential lots, and high seasonal groundwater making it difficult to construct new or replacement septic systems. Therefore, a centralized wastewater collection and treatment solution is proposed to rectify the problem faced by residents and businesses within the Stewart River service area and enable 100% compliance. State bond funding would assist in final design, bidding, and construction of the wastewater system that would remedy wastewater treatment issues within the service area.

Other Considerations

Over the past ten years of project development, and the creation of the service district, there has been widespread support from not only the property owners along the SRSSD corridor, but also from the Lake County Commissioners, the Town of Silver Creek Board of Supervisors, Lake Superior Coastal Program (DNR), Northshore Management Board and the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

NA

Who will own the facility?

The Town of Silver Creek

Who will operate the facility?

The Town of Silver Creek

Who will use or occupy this space?

Local residential and commercial end-users

Public Purpose

To protect public health, safety, and waters of the state.

Description of Previous Appropriations

NA

Project Contact Person

Mike Hoops
Town Board Supervisor
218-834-3263

mihoops@frontiernet.net

($ in thousands)

Stewart River Subordinate Service District - Wastewater Collection and Treatment System

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$8,693	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,693**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,490	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$895	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$14,000	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,385**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

St. Cloud, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Friedrich Regional Park	1	GO	$ 6,000	$ 0	$ 0
Accessibility Improvements St. Cloud's Historic Downtown	2	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Friedrich Regional Park

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$6,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Six million dollars ($6,000,000) in state funding is being requested to acquire land, predesign, design, construct, furnish and provide for a new City of St. Cloud Regional Park located in Sherburne County Minnesota titled “Friedrich Regional Park.”

Project Description

State bonding dollars of $6,000,000 are being requested to acquire lands totaling 120 acres, master plan, predesign, design, preserve, construct and furnish a new regional park consistent with the goals and strategies outlined in the 2003 City of St. Cloud Comprehensive Plan and the SCORP.

Acquisition of Lands – Estimated Cost = $1,000,000

Approximately 120 acres of new lands are desired to be acquired under this bonding request. The property contains many water-filled granite quarries, environmental features, rock outcroppings, historic features, forests, wetlands and open space areas desired for future construction and programming.

Master Planning & Pre-Design – Estimated Cost = $50,000

Friedrich Park is comprised of a multitude of environmentally sensitive land area types, historic features, geographical land forms, natural history, recreational opportunity and educational elements. The City’s will fully survey, master plan and pre-design in a manner that enhances the park by preserving the most valuable assets and provide access and amenities for all members of the public to enjoy. Planning for the best possible outcome is paramount to a successful overall project.

Design – Estimated Cost = $430,000

A recent public input meeting and site visit to Friedrich Park was conducted on May 7, 2015. The meeting provided great public insight and support for the project. Ideas for future development such as parking, public entry points, hiking trails, biking trails, Nordic skiing, snow shoeing, public restrooms, non-motorized boating, swimming, fishing, signage, security, scenic overlooks, picnic shelter, programming, educational opportunities, preservation and site furnishings were all highlighted. The City will use a thoughtful and well executed design process to incorporate the aforementioned ideas, as well as future ideas, into the overall design process to deliver a new regional park asset where no public opportunity currently exists.

Project Management – Estimated Cost = $25,000

Project management fees associated with State agencies, regional agencies, historical inventories, local agencies and any required environmental permits and necessary building permit fees.

Construction – Estimated Cost = $4,345,000

Given past experiences in providing regional park improvements, the City has estimated reasonable costs associated with elements likely to be associated with this request. Though we do know exactly what we will be constructing because a master planning and pre-design process has not been initiated, the following items are anticipated:

1. Site and Building Preparation ($500,000) – Clear necessary sites for public restrooms, shelters, trails and all public amenities mentioned above.
2. Demolition and decommissioning ($100,000) – Remove any necessary structures and foundations of eroding structures not eligible for listing on the historic register and/or any demolition of natural granite or quarry features deemed unsafe (i.e. grout piles or rock ledges).
3. Construction ($2,000,000) – Construct all public facilities and amenities that best exemplify the park and the intended master plan to be created.
4. Infrastructure/Roads/Utilities ($1,000,000) – Construct and install the necessary park entry road, parking, electric utility, water utility, wastewater utility and stormwater utilities to facilitate connections for structures and amenities.
5. Hazardous Materials Abatement ($300,000) – Clean-up of water-filled quarries located at the site. Remove any underwater or sub-surface debris or dumped items within the depths of the water-filled quarries. Create a system to mitigate any water quality issues that may be associated with the water filled quarries that will be programed in the future to allow for public swimming.
6. Testing ($30,000) – Hiring a geotechnical testing firm and water quality testing firm will be necessary to perform certain testing required for the project.
7. Construction Contingency ($400,000) – A 10% construction contingency fund is being included within the project budget to perform necessary project unknowns.
8. Other Construction Costs ($15,000) – Other construction costs are being added to the project budget in an effort to also help deal with future project unknowns. This cost can be associated with many elements of the future constructing phases and can help serve as project contingency to help pay for any future unknown items.

One Percent for the Arts – Estimated Cost = $50,000

This budget area will likely be utilized to help enhance the historical and educational elements of Friedrich Park. This may come in the form of interpretive signage, historical listing plaques and antiquity art relative to the granite mining history.

Site Furnishings Fixtures and Equipment – Estimated Cost = $100,000

Site furnishings and fixtures within the park such as picnic tables, benches, drinking fountains and garbage cans will be necessary to accommodate public use. Fencing and signage will also be necessary to inform and provide safety for the public. Lighting fixtures will be necessary in key gathering areas, as well as security cameras for public safety.

Key Funding Sources

The major funding source for the anticipated project is state bonding dollars. The City of St. Cloud is proposing a 5% match toward the bonding dollars received to support the project.

Project Rationale

The proposed project titled "Friedrich Regional Park" is part of the City's Comprehensive Plan to provide for a future East St. Cloud Regional Park. The project goal is to revive a once popular and iconic community outdoor recreation and natural resources conservation site that literally built and helped define St. Cloud as the Granite City.

Friedrich Park was created in the 1930s as New Deal reclamation of abandoned granite quarry land. The park comprises about 120 acres of land and has been owned by St. Cloud State University (SCSU) since 1935. Unfortunately, the park-and public access to the park- has been closed since 1976.

Friedrich Park was originally developed as a conservation, educational and recreation area for the St. Cloud State Teachers College (n.k.a. SCSU). The park was named for its creator, college faculty member and conservationist George W. Friedrich. Friedrich was the person principally responsible for its development. Labor was hired through the Works Progress Administration (WPA) and the National Youth Administration (NYA) programs to develop the original park. There also are many ideological links between Friedrich and Aldo Leopold, the foremost leader of his time in the theory and practice of wildlife management, conservation and ecology nationwide.

Friedrich Park contains many historical structures, educational sites, conservation vegetation plantings, and granite quarries that helped shape St. Cloud into the city that it is today:

- Entrance walls constructed in 1936 by the WPA and NYA. A pair of low dry-laid stone walls that flank the original entrance road.
- Stone steps constructed in 1936 by the WPA and NYA, located on the northern edge of the park entering the Dodd Quarry (once used for public swimming).
- Trail system developed in 1935-1936 by the WPA and NYA. Most of the trails are perpetuations of once preexisting old quarry roads.
- Quarry pits and structures that were opened and worked ca. 1885-1941. There are more than two dozen abandoned quarry pits within the park, as well as the foundations of numerous quarry structures. The park has many natural granite rock outcroppings.
- Conifer plantations that were planted ca. 1936 by WPA, NYA and students. About 20% of the park's tree canopy is mature conifers comprised of spruce, pines and cedar, typical of New Deal style plantings of that era for Central Minnesota.

George W. Friedrich's importance and contribution to statewide education cannot be overstated. He helped build and establish a number of the state's earliest wildlife protection and management organizations, beginning with the Minnesota Game Protective League. In the 1930's Friedrich was instrumental in the organization of the Minnesota Conservation Federation and its transformation into the state's largest conservation organization by the 1950's. Friedrich was active in the regional Midwest Conservation Alliance, established in 1935. He was on the board of directors of the Minnesota Wildlife Federation, he was the founder of the Minnesota Ornithologists' Union in the 1930s and named president in 1940. He was a longtime member of the Wilson Ornithological Club and a founder of the St. Cloud Bird Club.

In 1935, Friedrich was appointed to the State Conservation Commission (renamed the MNDNR in 1971). Friedrich continued to work on state-level policy after his service as a commissioner. He was instrumental in the creation of the Sand Dunes State Forest, established by the legislature in 1942. Friedrich spent at least 20 years as a leader member of the St. Cloud Park Board and became chair in 1942. He also was a member of the St. Cloud Recreation Board. He was instrumental in working with Parks Superintendent Joseph Munsinger to plan extensive New Deal-funded improvements to St. Cloud Parks.

The proposed project is needed to provide for an independent and new City of St. Cloud regional park facility where neither a regional park nor state park currently exist. There is a great need for additional regional parks in the St. Cloud area. The City of St. Cloud's Comprehensive Plan calls for a regional park facility to be located on St. Cloud's east side (Sherburne County). In addition, the vision of the Minnesota State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan 2014-2018 (SCORP) states:

"Minnesota's outdoor recreation opportunities connect everyone to the outdoors. They create experiences that inspire a legacy of stewardship for the natural world and they provide fun, outdoor recreational opportunities that strengthen friendships, families, health and spirit now and into the future. Minnesotans experience the full range of benefits that outdoor recreation provides, reinforcing our identity as an outdoor culture."

The City of St. Cloud can help accomplish the SCORP vison with financial assistance from the State of Minnesota through its capital bonding process to launch the Friedrich Regional Park project.

The State of Minnesota and local governments are experiencing declines when it comes to the involvement of youth, youth participation, adult and senior opportunities relative to many traditional programs, educational and outdoor recreational opportunities. Minnesota is not escaping a broad trend of declining per-capita participation in nature-based outdoor recreation in the United States. This is a national trend that impacts national parks, national trails, state parks, state trails and other outdoor recreational facilities. It includes many outdoor activities such as hunting, fishing, boating, wildlife watching, swimming, playing and wilderness experience use. Although the decline in these activities in Minnesota is not as large as the national decline, it is still present.

A number of secondary factors also contribute to the decline in participation rates for traditional nature-based outdoor recreation activities. As the population ages, participation in recreation activities generally declines. Similarly, as our state has become increasingly urban as well as increasingly racially/ethnically diverse, participation in traditional outdoor recreation activities statewide has declined.

Declines in participation reduce the number of Minnesotans who receive the personal and community benefits of outdoor recreation. These include physical activity, social and family bonding, sense of place, community pride and overall quality of life benefits that being active outdoors produces. Declines in participation also reduce positive environmental impacts gained from recreating outdoors. Further, engaging with nature helps to produce a citizenry with an appreciation of the natural world that raises social and political support for resource conservation activities.

Decreasing participation in outdoor recreation may also contribute to poor health and associated high medical costs. In Minnesota 62.8% of adults are either overweight or obese and less than half meet recommended levels of physical activity. Prevalence of obesity among children and adolescents in the United States quadrupled among 6 to 11 year olds and more than tripled among 12 to 19 year olds between 1971-1974 and 1999-2000. In 2000, medical costs in Minnesota associated with obesity were $1.3 billion and medical costs associated with physical inactivity were $495 million.

The City of St. Cloud desires to help reverse these statewide trends by implementing a strategic direction whereby the City envisions the Friedrich Regional Park project to:

1. Begin to reconnect more adults and youth to the outdoors by providing innovative and sound programming.
2. Provide free access for all. We believe participation cost have limited participation statewide. St. Cloud's local and regional users should have access to outdoor recreational lands and facilities that they can get to easily with amenities they can use and enjoy. They should not be burdened with travel expenses, park entry fees and parking fees.
3. Innovate and market what we have and what we plan to accomplish. Persuade and remind the community about the positive effects of outdoor recreational opportunities.
4. Provide quality experiences, facilities and programs for all to enjoy and engage. High quality of life experiences promote increased use and long term users.
5. Provide programming and special events that help new users understand and enjoy new experiences. Programming and special events also engage participants to foster lifelong participation.
6. Develop strong partnerships in an effort to reach more people. Partnerships help provide for more services and help maintain high quality facilities and programs.
7. Create infrastructure and amenities by acquiring land and creating opportunities through

development and redevelopment of facilities.

The City of St. Cloud understands that demand for the limited available funding is significant. However additional funding is needed so that outdoor recreation facilities can fulfill their vital role in connecting people to the outdoors and creating the next generation of natural resource stewards. The close-to-home experiences are essential if the SCORP vision as well as the City comprehensives plans are to be achieved.

Other Considerations

The proposed Friedrich Regional Park project is a source of excitement for many individuals, citizens, organizations and community members. These supporters have issued many statements and letters in support of this state bonding application. Most notably this proposal is supported by the following organizations and their membership:

- The Rotary Club of St. Cloud
- The Mid MN Cycling Club
- The Natural Parks & Trails Coalition
- SCSU Outdoor Endeavors
- Southeast St. Cloud Neighborhood Preservation Coalition

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

If bonding dollars are received for this project it is not anticipated that the City of St. Cloud would request any new or additional state operating dollars to support this request. However, it is possible that the City may request future Legacy Amendment funding through a competitive process outside of this proposed bonding request to help assist with any future needs.

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Cloud

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. Cloud

Who will use or occupy this space?

The entity and occupancy will be one of public use and no privatized uses are anticipated. When the park is fully developed it will be operated and maintained for public use.

Public Purpose

The public purpose served by this project provides the following: 1. Access to the project site would allow for active and passive use of the area to observe and view the natural and scenic qualities. 2. This site presents opportunities for interpretation of and education about the Minnesota County Biological Survey; pre-settlement land cover of this area; oak forest ecosystems; St. Cloud geology; granite quarry and excavation; landfills, water pollution, etc. 3. Quality of life experiences - The site helps meet the goals and strategies highlighted in the 2003 City of St. Cloud Comprehensive Plan and the State of Minnesota Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan 2014-2016.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Scott Zlotnik
Park & Recreation Director
320-650-3170
scott.zlotnik@ci.stcloud.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Friedrich Regional Park

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$300	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,300**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$50	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$430	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$25	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,345	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$50	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$100	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$562	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,562**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Accessibility Improvements St. Cloud's Historic Downtown

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$2 million in State funds are requested to provide financial assistance for accessibility improvements within and between St. Cloud's downtown buildings. Funds will be utilized by local businesses, public bodies, and property owners to improve accessibility for all residents and foster reuse and reinvestment through all levels of downtown's historic structures.

Project Description

Downtown St. Cloud is home to more than 60 historic buildings; two-thirds of which contribute to the City's historic commercial district. Most of those buildings were constructed for commercial use as retail stores, banks, office buildings, and hotels from the early 1880s to 1936. Improved accessibility within these structures will foster reinvestment by property owners, spur economic development and job growth, and increase utilization by all people.

The City of St. Cloud has administered a CDBG funded grant program during the past two years providing financial assistance to downtown property owners and businesses improving accessibility of their buildings. St. Cloud's CDBG entitlement amount is insufficient to meet the growing community demand from low-moderate income eligible activities, while also funding the immediate demand for downtown accessibility. The City, by necessity, must seek other funding sources to continue its grant program and dramatically improve accessibility in the short-term. If funded, the downtown accessibility program would provide $2,000,000 for planning and construction of private and public accessibility improvements.

The St. Cloud Downtown Council conducted a property inventory and identified eight historic buildings within downtown St. Cloud in need of accessibility improvements. Each of those buildings currently have vacancies and/or underutilized floor area given modern building code deficiencies. Property owners have expressed a strong desire to resolve these deficiencies and reinvest in the properties. However, costs of retrofitting historic structures are high and economically infeasible given the limited return in greater Minnesota markets. The eight identified buildings total 85,438 gross square feet with approximately $2,393,000 in estimated market value. Property owners have indicated their intention to remodel, retrofit, and/or convert use in these buildings as a result of the accessibility improvements resulting in more than $6,600,000 in total investment; more than doubling of current estimated market value. These parcels are representative of the need and interest in a continued accessibility grant program that fuels the current downtown renaissance.

The City of St. Cloud has made sporadic progress toward installation of a public skyway system across the downtown. Further investment is needed to realize an interconnected system of accessible corridors between public and private buildings within the downtown. Public accessibility improvements will be targeted to locations that support private investment and address accessibility needs throughout downtown.

Project Rationale

The bonding request would provide financial assistance to design and construct accessibility improvements within public (e.g.; skyways, elevators) and private spaces (e.g.; ramps, elevators) that address the Minnesota Accessibility Code and Americans with Disabilities Act and their regulations, codes, guidelines, and polices. Reinvestment, reuse, and revitalization of these structures is hampered by modern building and accessibility code requirements. The overall goal of the program is to make downtown buildings accessible to, functional for, and safe for use by people living with ambulatory difficulties.

Other Considerations

The City of St. Cloud is experiencing a renaissance given its unique collection of historic buildings on the Mississippi River in the core of Minnesota. Vacancy within downtown storefronts has dropped to less than 3%. Job growth has resulted in opening of more service businesses and cultural amenities and the construction of downtown's first modern loft complex in 2015. The time is now to implement a granting program that supplements the existing private investment in main street storefronts and expand that trend into the lower and upper levels of downtown's historic buildings.

According to the US Census Bureau's 2008 American Community Survey, 3,862 persons with ambulatory difficulties reside within Benton and Stearns County. These residents and thousands of other annual visitors from the State and region will benefit from a more accessible downtown in their personal and professional experiences in central Minnesota's largest intact historic downtown.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Downtown accessibility improvements will not require additional State operating dollars. Operations and maintenance will be the responsibility of the City and private property owners where applicable.

Who will own the facility?

Facilities are both publicly and privately owned.

Who will operate the facility?

Operation and maintenance of accessibility improvements within private buildings will be the responsibility of the property owner. The City of St. Cloud will be responsible for operation and maintenance of public accessibility improvements.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The City of St. Cloud and St. Cloud Downtown Council have already identified more than eight historic properties that are in need of accessibility improvements to solidify, expand, and/or allow conversion to retail, office, restaurant, and other commercial uses. Other downtown property owners continue to show interest in reinvestment projects were a granting program to proceed.

Public Purpose

Downtown accessibility improvements will spur reinvestment, economic development and job growth, and increase utilization by all people.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Matt Glaesman
Community Development Director
320-650-3110
matt.glaesman@ci.stcloud.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Accessibility Improvements St. Cloud's Historic Downtown

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$50	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$200	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,579	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$171	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

St. James, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Highway 4 and Allied projects	1	GO	$ 2,000	$ 0	$ 0
Storm Water Main St. James Lake/St.James Creek	2	GO	$ 1,250	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,250	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,250	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Highway 4 and Allied projects

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	In 2016 and 2017 1.6 miles of Highway 4 will be reconstructed running north to south through the City of St. James. As part of this project the city will also be reconstructing approximately 1.1 miles of street and infrastructure as part of the infrastructure requirements of the Highway 4 project

Project Description

MnDOT has scheduled to do a complete reconstruction of Highway 4 in 2016 and 2017 in a two year phase due to the extensive work that needs to be completed. As part of this project the City of St. James is responsible for the street lighting, the parking lane, sidewalk, a portion of the storm sewer. IN addition in order to meet MnDOT's 10 year storm design standard a significant amount of funds will be needed to upgrade the storm water drainage system. As the reconstruction will have a concrete surface the city needs to replace water main and sanitary sewer main in the highway and to address the upgrading of infrastructure in approximately 1.1 miles of street and infrastructure adjacent to the highway. The estimated cost of the water and sanitary sewer project will be $ 3,409,000.00 We have applied for a PFA loan/grant assistance for this portion of the project. We are also addressing safe streets with sidewalk the entire length of the project and that will be in compliance with ADA. Estimated cost of the Street and Storm Sewer portion of the project is $ 4,406,000.00

Project Rationale

Highway 4 has a travel rate of .5 on a scale of 1 to 10 by MnDOT and as the reconstruction will be in concrete it is imperative that the city replace infrastructure which is in some cases over 100 years of age. The rationale for requesting bonding assistance is due to the fact that the entire project cost for the city is anticipated to exceed $ 7,815,000.00.

Other Considerations

The city's bond rating was recently downgraded due to the amount of city debt and the stagnant tax base. The city has been working closely with MnDOT on this project and will be constructing the first mini-roundabouts on a state highway project and one block of back-in parking in the commercial business district. We were recently informed by the Federal Highway Transportation Department that MnDOT and the city were awarded a grant of $ 864,000.00 for the mini-round about portion of the project.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

user fees, special assessments and general taxation will increase significantly.

Who will own the facility?

City of St. James

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. James

Who will use or occupy this space?

none

Public Purpose

streets, water service, sanitary sewer service, storm water drainage

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Joe McCabe
City Manager
507-375-3241
joe.mccabe@ci.stjames.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Highway 4 and Allied projects

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$203	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$2,203	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,406**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$367	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,836	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$193	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,396**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Storm Water Main St. James Lake/St.James Creek

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,250
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	Replace the storm sewer drain which serves St. James Lake and the entire southern section of the City of St. James

Project Description

St. James Lake was originally drained over land accross the southern part of the City of St. James and at some point in time due to continous flooding the city with the possible cooperation of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources installed a storm sewer line close to the natural flow of water to an outlet to St. James Creek - approximately 6,200 linear feet. This concrete pipe has collapsed at some locations and recent televising has shown that a significant amount of the pipe has deteriorated to the point of needing replacement. The storm sewer line is currently in two parks, a high school football field, baseball diamond, in the front yard of a school and in city streets. Estimated cost of replacement $ 2,500,000.

Project Rationale

This project has a significant impact on St. James Lake which is filled with water from natural springs and run off from farm fields to the west of the city. The storm sewer was constructed through a signficant area of the southern part of the city.

Other Considerations

A portion of the line recently collapsed and required emergency repair. If this repair was nto completed pror to the next storm event, local surface flooding would have occurred in the drainage area upstream of the collapse. This is the second major collapse in a street within the past three years. It is imperative that the line be replaced before a more serious failure occurs..

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of St. James

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. James

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

Drain St. James Lake and provide storm water drainage for the southern part of the City of St. James

Description of Previous Appropriations

none

Project Contact Person

Joe McCabe
City Manager
507-375-3241
joe.mccabe@ci.stjames.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Storm Water Main St. James Lake/St.James Creek

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,250	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$125	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$1,125	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

St. Joseph, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Pedestrian Crossing Bridge- County Road 75	1	GO	$ 1,250	$ 0	$ 0
2017 St. Joseph Community Center	2	GO	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,250	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,250	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Pedestrian Crossing Bridge- County Road 75

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,250
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Construction of a pedestrian bridge over CR 75, which is a east/west four lane principal arterial, with an average daily traffic count exceeding 22,000. The construction of a pedestrian crossing would provide residents and visitors safe access to the trails, retail, medical, and residential units located on either side of CR 75. The estimated cost of the crossing is $ 2,000,000 to $ 3,000,00.

Project Description

The City of St. Joseph has diligently worked to connect all areas of the City to the parks and trails system. The Wobegon Trail is a major trail component for the City and is regional in nature as it extends to St. Cloud, Waite Park, Sartell, Sauk Rapids, Holdingford, Albany, Avon and many more. The trail hosts many bike rides throughout the year and with St. Joseph being the trail head the parking lot is consistently full from participants who drive to St. Joseph to enter the trail. During rides, it is common to see participants looking to come into the City, only to be met with the difficulty of crossing CR 75. When available and for large events, the City will have to send police officers to help manage the crossing allowing for safe access. By providing a safe crossing over CSAH 75, bikers, walkers and runners could freely cross CSAH 75 and access all the trail opportunities available in St. Joseph.

The City is committed to promoting healthy and active living and recently expended over $ 1,000,000 in trail expansions to the Wobegon. Not many cities have access to major bike paths where miles are endless; St. Joseph is seeking a funding to create a safe entrance for all trail users.

Project Rationale

CSAH 75 is a Principal Arterial roadway corridor which essentially bisects the City of St. Joseph into a northern and southern half. As the community and the volume of traffic on CSAH 75 has grown over the years, the highway has increasingly become a physical barrier for safe pedestrian crossing, particularly to its recreational opportunities (Wobegon Trail, Millstream Park) and institutions (College of St. Benedict, Kennedy Elementary and St. John's University). While four of the eight streets intersecting CSAH 75 are signalized, only two intersections have pedestrian facilities on both sides of CSAH 75.

The City of St. Joseph manages and maintains the trailhead for the Wobegon Trail which is heavily used. For many of the events, the St. Joseph police department must provide assistance to cross CR 75. People participating in events are looking to come to the commercial area for beverages or minor needs and their is not a safe mechanism for that. In addition, which the north portion of the City includes the Wobegon Trail, the south side of the City provides access to the Glacial Lakes Trail which extends west and south along Highway 23.

Other Considerations

The City of St. Joseph is a community of approximately 6,800 that has some development constraints. First the City has a major College located in the center of the City and its partner school located 2 miles west of St. Joseph. Between both schools and additional 4,000 youthful residents reside in the City for 10 months of each year. Unfortunately the City does not receive any tax revenue from the College, but still must provide services. This same group of youthful residents reside on either side of CR 75 and must cross the principal arterial at street level which is not desirable.

The second constraint is the community is bisected by CR 75 with equal number of residents living on either side. The City has seen some commercial activity and residents and visitors are looking to safely cross CR 75. The City has worked with the Stearns County Engineer on the concerns and the best they could do was look at the timer for the crossing at controlled intersections. Based on the speed and volume of traffic safety is a real concern.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The estimated maintenance for the crossing is between $ 10,000 - $ 15,000.

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Joseph will own the facility

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Joseph will be responsible for the facility

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

The proposed pedestrian crossing meets the public purpose as it promotes the following: * Public Health - promotes a healthy living and active recreation; * Safety - creates a safe crossing for pedestrians, which is not available today * Prosperity - encourages people to use the trail system adding to the economic prosperity of St. Joseph allowing for additional commercial and residential ventures. * General Welfare - residents/visitors are afraid to cross CSAH 75 without a vehicle and a crossing will add the needed security.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Judy Weyrens
Administrator
320-363-7201
jweyrens@cityofstjoseph.com

($ in thousands)

Pedestrian Crossing Bridge- County Road 75

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,250	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$1,250	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$32	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,532**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$200	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$50	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$250	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$50	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,950	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$339,750	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$342,250**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

2017 St. Joseph Community Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	The City of St. Joseph is in need of a community center that not only serves the residents of the City of St. Joseph, but the residents of the neighboring township and Cities that identify with St. Joseph. The Community Center would provide for active and passive recreation for residents of all ages, including programming to bring the ages together.

Project Description

The City Council established a community center facility to study the needs of the area and what type of programming is desired. The Committee included members from the City of St. Joseph, St. Joseph Township, the College of St. Benedict/St. Johns University, as well a members from service groups such as the senior citizens and youth group. This committee reported back to the City Council that the St. Joseph are is lacking is the following areas: gymnasium space for walking or active recreation; multi function rooms for group to gather and socialize such as a senior citizen room, teen room or general gathering space; an activity room for pre-school through teen and meeting spaces for the many service groups located in the area.

The Committee also recognized that the original grade school facility, now owned by ISD 742 was available for purchase and the community has a connection to that space. The school was originally built by the community and turned over to ISD 742 in the 1970's. The same group that helped build this school in the 1960's is looking for a community center, again this group includes residents from the area, not just the City of St. Joseph

Project Rationale

The City of St. Joseph is a community of 6,800 with the College of St. Benedict located in the heart of the City, and its partner school St. John’s University located two miles west. Between the two schools, they provide education to approximately 4,000 students who either live or activity participate in activities within the City. In addition the City of St. Joseph is home to the Monastery of St. Benedict, which is the home monastery for the Sisters of the Order of St. Benedict.

While the City is proud to have the College and Monastery of St. Benedict within the corporate limits, it comes at a high costs. Using numbers from 2012, approximately 44% of the taxable market value in the City is tax exempt, consuming services and not having to contribute to the cost. A large portion of the City budget is designated to public safety due to the 4,000 young adults between the ages of 18 – 22. It is becoming more difficult to balance the needs and wants of the residents with the available resources.

Like most communities the City is faced with aging infrastructure that needs replacement, at the same time the residents of St. Joseph have expressed a desire to have a community center that would be used for recreation, socialization, and education. The facility would provide for active

recreation by means of a gymnasium and fitness programs; passive recreation to include bringing senior citizens together to play cards or games, socialize and eat together; socialization to provide a space for residents to rent to host events for family or for service clubs to hold fundraisers; and education to include a space for St. Joseph to display it rich history, adding space for the St. Joseph Historical Society, which currently has a small space with artifacts in storage; and education to provide space for outreach to the community.

St. Joseph is on the western edge of the St. Cloud regional area and currently residents have to go to St. Cloud for the activities they are requesting. Located 2 miles north of St. Joseph is a dense housing development located in St. Wendel Township. This area consists of over 424 single family homes, all of whom identify with St. Joseph, yet they are not residents. This is just one of many examples residential developments outlying St. Joseph that would actively use a community center.

In a market study prepared for the City of St. Joseph, the trade or market area identified by an outside consultant indicated that the St. Joseph services as a destination point for people west of St. Joseph. Therefore, the Community Center would serve as a center for that population as well. St. Joseph serves to the communities north and west of St. Joseph as a regional center the same as St. Cloud serves the cites of St. Augusta, Waite Park, etx.

Other Considerations

As stated above the City of St. Joseph has a disproportionate tax base, as a large portion of the property in the City of St. Joseph is tax exempt, yet consume services that must be provided. If the City could capture property tax from the tax exempt properties the City would receive over $ 900,000 in taxes. The City realizes that the tax system allows certain properties to be exempt, but if they would have to pay at least public safety services, which are documented that they receive through police reports, the City would realize about $ 270,000 in additional taxes, again allowing the City to provide services and recreational opportunities with assistance. It is anticipated that the residents that reside at the college/university would also take advantage of the community service as well as their visitors.

At the same time, the City has residents in nearby townships that identify with St. Joseph that complain they do not get to participate in some programming. A good example was the compost site, since the City pays for the staffing, we limited the service to those that pay taxes to the City and the Council received considerable outcry from the those outside the City. Finally the City agreed to allow them to use the facility and charged a non resident fee. Residents from the areas around St. Joseph to the north and west have asked to be part of the planning process and have expressed concern that a facility is needed.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

It is anticipated that the operating budget will be between $ 230,000 and $ 250,000, which will be offset in part to some programming and lease fees.

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Joseph will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Joseph will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The City has entered into a long term lease agreement with music based day care who will be a permanent tenant in the community center. It is anticipated that senior programming will be planned as a normal part of afternoon activities at the community center.

Public Purpose

The addition of a community center is a public purpose benefiting not only the City of St. Joseph but the residents of the communities to the north and west of St. Joseph. The community center will promote the following: * Public Health - the community center programming will include education and programs through the local medical clinic other community partners. The gymnasium and outreach will provide opportunities for moderate exercise and socialization. * Safety - the community center will provide for a safe place for participants to walk or engage in recreation activities without worrying about the weather conditions. * General Welfare - It is anticipated that a recreation center will encourage people to not live a sedentary lifestyle and would promote a healthier emotional and physical lifestyle. * Contentment - It is anticipated that during the dark days of winter a gathering place can be provided to help provide positive lifestyles.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Judy Weyrens
Administrator
320-363-7201
jweyrens@cityofstjoseph.com

($ in thousands)

2017 St. Joseph Community Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$2,300,000	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$2,300,000**	**$2,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$25	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$175	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$150	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,650	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$309,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$311,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Mesabi Trail Extension 2016	1	GO	$ 1,700	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 1,700	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 1,700	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Mesabi Trail Extension 2016

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,700
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$1.7 million in state funds to construct a 4.5 mile long segment of the Mesabi Trail from Whalston Road, located in Kuegler Township to the City of Tower Locomotive Park and Recreation Center. The Mesabi Trail is a ten (10) foot wide bituminous surfaced trail designed and built in accordance with the MN Dot Bicycle Design Manual.

Project Description

This new segment of the Mesabi Trail, hereafter known as the "Project", begins at Whalston Road located within Section 29, T61N, R15W, Kuegler Township and ending at the City of Tower, Locomotive Park located within Section 32, T62N, R15W. This Project is a four and one-half (4.5) miles long, ten (10) feet bituminous surface with two (2) feet wide gavel shoulders. This project will involve right-of-way acquisition (no state funds involved with land acquisition) environmental documentation, engineering design, construction and construction management/engineering.

This Project, in keeping with the Mesabi Trail Master Plan, is a regional trail in Northeast Minnesota that connects communities, provides a transportation corridor, promotes healthy lifestyles and is ADA compliant. The trail traverses multiple landscapes, natural settings, state parks, state and county and federal forests, lakes and streams. The trail travels through many cultural settings that are interpreted including Native American, European settlers, logging era, former iron mining era and current iron mining operations. The trail connects 24 communities with yearly users exceeding 200,000 per year of which, 34% arrive from outside of the northeast MN region. The trail is designated non-motorized with the exception of certain trail segments designated for winter snowmobiling. Twenty seven (27) miles of the trail are designated for snowmobile use.

Trail constructed through a natural setting is carefully located to minimize adverse impacts to waters, wetlands and wildlife. The trail does pass through wildlife areas designated as critical habitat for threatened or endangered species such as the Long Eared Bat and Canadian Lynx, however; proposed trail construction corridors are vigorously reviewed by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, MN DNR Fish & Wildlife, MN DNR Waters, Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and local agencies. In addition, designated land use, property ownership, cultural resources, farmlands, recreational areas and other elements are reviewed, changed or approved by the National Environmental Protection Agency, Minnesota Environmental Protection Agency, MN State Historic Preservation Office and local agencies.

State funds will be used for three elements of this project further described as follows. State funds will not be used for right-of-way acquisition or administrative costs.

1. **Environmental Work** needed for Federal NEPA & State MEPA and other Federal, State and

Local approvals and permits.

Environmental work needed to comply with Federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Minnesota Environmental Protection Act (MEPA). As part of NEPA and MEPA, we will be analyzing the "Universe" of trail route alternatives that could be used and then "down – select" to the most preferred alternative. Along with a no-build alternative, land use, social, economic & other impacts will be considered. Environment and cultural resource are usually the most sensitive impacts for new trail construction particularly avoidance and/or minimization of impacts to waters, wetlands, protected wildlife, vegetation and historic sites.

Cost for conducting the environmental work is estimated to be 2% of the project cost or $34,000.

2. Design and Engineering Work needed to perform design, survey, plans, specification and construction management.

Trail design will be conducted in accordance with the MN Dot Bikeway Facility Design Manual. Engineering work begins with support of the environmental work and then to more specific survey work including property lines, topographic, paying particular attention to vertical alignment and horizontal curves. Survey is followed by trail design in accordance with MN Dot standards, Federal standards and ASHTO with on-site conditions such as waterways, wetlands, hills, valleys determining the final trail design. The engineer will prepare a construction plan and specification, prepare construction bid documents and assist with contracts. The engineer will provide construction management that includes on-site contractor inspection, testing oversight, processing payments and other work as needed.

Cost for conducting the engineering work is estimated to be 8% of the project cost or $136,000.

3. Trail Construction will be performed by a responsible, bonded and insured contractor. The Contractor will be selected using County or State public bidding process with established contracts, employee compensation and benefit rates, DBE goals and all other applicable laws and rules associated with the use of State Bond funds. The contractor will construct the trail in accordance with engineers plan and specifications. Contractor is responsible to perform construction using methods that are in accordance with OSHA, NEPA and other industry standards. Trail construction costs are estimated to be $340,000 per mile of trail for a length of 4.5 miles.

Cost for trail construction is estimated to be 90% of the project cost or $1,530,000.

Project Rationale

The Mesabi Trail is a regional trail in Northeast Minnesota that extends from the Mississippi River to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area that connects communities, provides a transportation corridor, promotes healthy lifestyles and is ADA compliant. The trail's planned distance is 145 miles in length with 110 miles complete in year 2015. 35 miles of trail remains to be constructed mainly in the eastern trail region between the cities of Biwabik, Tower and Ely.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The St. Louis and Lake Counties Regional Railroad Authority (RRA) currently budgets $300,000 per year to operate and maintain the existing 110 miles of Mesabi Trail that equates to approximately $3,000 per trail mile per year. The additional 4.5 miles of trail described within this request will add $13,500 per year to the RRA operating and maintenance budget. No state operating or maintenance dollars are needed or will be requested for this trail.

Who will own the facility?

St. Louis and Lake Counties Regional Railroad Authority

Who will operate the facility?

St. Louis and Lake Counties Regional Railroad Authority

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Provides a transportation corridor, is a recreational opportunity, promotes healthy lifestyles, connects communities and is ADA compliant.

Description of Previous Appropriations

1996 $500,000 to construct Mesabi Trail segment Hibbing to Chisholm

2005 $300,000 to construct Mesabi Station facility

2010 $1,000,000 to construct Mesabi Trail segment Soudan easterly through Vermillion State Park

Project Contact Person

Robert Manzoline
Executive Director
218-744-2653
bmanzoline@rrauth.com

($ in thousands)

Mesabi Trail Extension 2016

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,700	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,700**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$170	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$1,332	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$221	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,723**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
St. Louis County - Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency (AEOA) and Range Mental Health Center (RMHC) Office	1	GO	$ 15,500	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 15,500	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 15,500	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

St. Louis County - Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency (AEOA) and Range Mental Health Center (RMHC) Office

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$15,500
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	St. Louis County is requesting $15.5 million in state funds for the $31 million second phase of a new building project which will include property acquisition and construction. This facility will house offices and programming space for Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency (AEOA), Range Mental Health Center (RMHC) and St. Louis County.

Project Description

This 2016 Capital Appropriation request is for **$15.5 million** and provides for the co-location of AEOA, RMHC and St. Louis County in a new, energy-efficient facility.

Project Rationale

AEOA, RMHC and St. Louis County have come together to collaborate and establish a new combined facility where they could more efficiently and effectively serve some of the most economically, mentally, and socially vulnerable people in NE Minnesota. The project co-locates AEOA, RMHC, and St. Louis County in one combined facility that will: 1.) improve overall access and opportunities for clients through centralized services and new and innovative collaborative programming, 2.) respond to current deteriorating and deficient facility conditions and provide appropriate space for current and future organizational operations, and 3.) leverage costs related to construction, operations, energy efficiency, and shared personnel and programming.

Other Considerations

Prior to the collaboration of all three entities, the initial cost estimates for two separate facilities (one for St. Louis County and one for AEOA/RMHC) totaled approximately $44 million. Estimates for the combined facility and an associated parking ramp are approximately $34 million; a cost savings of about 25% from the original plan to construct two separate facilities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

St. Louis County, AEOA and RMHC expect to realize savings related to: lower incidences of facilities maintenance/repairs, utilities cost reductions due to energy efficiency and improved building technology, and reduced transportation costs in the new facility. AEOA and RMHC also anticipate revenue increases from new and expanded programming and services.

Who will own the facility?

St. Louis County

Who will operate the facility?

St. Louis County will operate the facility with participation by AEOA and RMHC.

Who will use or occupy this space?

AEOA and RMHC will be the private entities occupying and using the combined facility. Between these agencies, a total of 365 employees will be located in the new facility (AEOA- 215 employees, RMHC- 150 employees). The current proposal adds the co-location of St. Louis County's Virginia Service Center which is currently under review and planning. This would represent an additional 200 employees, for a potential total of up to 565.

Public Purpose

St. Louis County is a local government entity dedicated to effective and efficient public service. Please refer to the uploaded agency profile for more information. AEOA and RMHC are well-established private, non-profit organizations that serve thousands of economically, mentally, and socially challenged residents across an 8-county region in NE Minnesota. This rural region covers nearly 20,000 square miles and encompasses a population of approximately 356,000 people. Populations served include children, families, adults, seniors, veterans, and nursing home residents. The two agencies provide essential services including employment training, Head Start, youth and adult education, homeless services, basic needs support, foster care, drop-in centers, housing development, rural transportation, senior nutrition, crisis center care, detoxification, and treatment for mental health and chemical dependency.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In 2014, St. Louis County was awarded $3 million (no match required) for Phase I of this project, the planning and predesign of a new office facility to be located in the city of Virginia to house AEOA and RMHC and also for land acquisition and site work to the extent that there are sufficient funds (Laws of Minnesota 2014, Chapter 294, Section 18, Human Services, Subdivision 8). A predesign/design grant agreement between the Minnesota Department of Human Services and St. Louis County is complete. Predesign, design, and site selection/acquisition activities are anticipated to be completed within the next twelve months.

Project Contact Person

Peter J. Miller
Capital Planning Manager
218-726-2357
millerp@stlouiscountymn.gov

($ in thousands)

St. Louis County - Arrowhead Economic Opportunity Agency (AEOA) and Range Mental Health Center (RMHC) Office

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$15,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
General Obligation Bonds	$3,000	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
County Funds	$0	$5,200	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$10,300	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$3,000**	**$31,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$1,200	$200	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$140	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$1,660	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$27,091	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$3,709	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$3,000**	**$31,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

St. Louis Park, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Beltline LRT Station Avenue Roadway Improvements	1	GO	$ 775	$ 3,588	$ 0
Wooddale LRT Station Area Improvements	2	GO	$ 2,324	$ 7,417	$ 0
Louisiana Station Area Access and Circulation Improvements	3	GO	$ 173	$ 3,287	$ 0
Whistle Quiet Zone	4	GO	$ 105	$ 0	$ 945
Total Project Requests			$ 3,377	$ 14,292	$ 945
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,377	$ 14,292	$ 945

($ in thousands)

Beltline LRT Station Avenue Roadway Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$775
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$4.363 million for intersection improvements and roadway construction in the Beltline SW Light Rail Transit Station area. The intersection at Belt Line Boulevard and CSAH 25 is the major access point for park and ride, pedestrian and bike access. The project will include the extension of Lynn Avenue south and west along rail right-of-way to connect, provide access and create defined development blocks for transit-oriented developments. It also includes improvements on Belt Line Boulevard to accommodate bikes and pedestrians.

Project Description

The project includes intersection improvements including additional turn lanes, pedestrian crossings and other geometric improvements to facilitate traffic flow. Lynn Avenue is outfitted with a traffic light, and the proposal is to extend Lynn to the south and along the rail right-of-way to create good access for cars as well as strong access for pedestrians and bicyclists coming from the north. On Belt Line Boulevard, additional sidewalks and trails are planned, as well as an on-street bike lane.

Project Rationale

In working with the Southwest Project Office (SPO), the city has undertaken design of improvements to facilitate structured versus surface parking in order for transit-oriented development to occur on the site. To facilitate access and circulation, improvements beyond what the SPO is including in the SWLRT project will be necessary to accommodate new development and create convenient places for transit riders to live and work.

In order to capture auto drivers coming from the Highway 100 to the station, access in and out of the park and ride will be via CSAH 25 versus Belt Line Boulevard. Park and ride traffic will be directed to the CSAH 25 versus Belt Line Boulevard, thereby avoiding more auto traffic crossing the light rail and freight rail tracks. This eliminates a large amount of auto/train/pedestrian/bike conflicts and reduces traffic congestion. A traffic signal at Lynn Avenue and CSAH 25 will be present to facilitate left turns out of the site, including for buses. Continuing Lynn Avenue to the south and creating a new “backage” road parallel to the rail right-of-way allows much better access to the station, parking, and future development. The grid roadway system created will facilitate appropriate sized development areas to develop in a transit friendly fashion. It is expected the development will include business, employment, and living opportunities and increase transit ridership.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minimal

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Louis Park owns Belt Line Boulevard and will own Lynn Avenue and the backage road when they are extended, as well as the sidewalks in the area. Hennepin County owns CSAH #25.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Louis Park and Hennepin County will own and maintain the roadway systems.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Improving access and circulation in a congested area that will become an SW Light Rail Transit station area with park and ride.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Meg McMonigal
Principal Planner
952-924-2573
mmcmonigal@stlouispark.org

($ in thousands)

Beltline LRT Station Avenue Roadway Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$775	$3,588	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$775	$3,588	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,550**	**$7,176**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$375	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$200	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$200	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$400	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$3,188	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	($305)	$41	($622)
TOTAL	**$0**	**$470**	**$3,629**	**($622)**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Wooddale LRT Station Area Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,324
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$9.741 million to design a roadway extension under the rail corridor to connect Xenwood Avenue to the Highway 7 frontage road, a stairway connection to the Cedar Lake Regional Trail, and other roadway and pedestrian/bikeway improvements.

Project Description

The construction of a roadway extension under the rail corridor will connect Xenwood Avenue to the Highway 7 frontage road. This connection will increase access to an area where it will be reduced to right-in/right out access along Wooddale Avenue as part of the light rail project. The proposal is to tunnel under the regional trail, light rail and freight rail to connect Xenwood Avenue from 36th Street to the Trunk Highway 7 frontage road. A signal at 36th Street and Xenwood Avenue facilitates traffic movements in and out of the area. The project also includes lowering the frontage road 8-10 feet and moving some major utility lines; both of these items add significantly to the costs.

Project Rationale

As a result of the Southwest Light Rail Transit Project near the planned Wooddale Station, a median is proposed on Wooddale Avenue, which restricts left turns in and out of the area between Highway 7 and the frontage road. An alternative access under the freight and light rail lines will provide full access to these properties. One of the properties contains 151 residential apartments. The other property was formerly a coffee plant, and the City's Economic Development Authority has purchased it for redevelopment purposes. The City is working with a developer to create a sustainable, mixed-use, transit-oriented development (TOD) on the site. Without full access, the site is not able to redevelop in a TOD manner and may be very limited in capacity due to the limited access.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minimal

Who will own the facility?

The City of St. Louis Park will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

The City of St. Louis Park will operate the facility.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

The new roadway connection seeks to allow access and improve circulation in a congested area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Meg McMonigal
Principal Planner
952-924-2573
mmcmonigal@stlouispark.org

($ in thousands)

Wooddale LRT Station Area Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,324	$7,417	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$2,324	$7,417	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,648**	**$14,834**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$412	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$412	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$824	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$6,593	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	($309)	($205)	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$2,015**	**$7,212**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Louisiana Station Area Access and Circulation Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$173
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	A $3.460 million project that includes acquiring right-of-way, removal of a portion of the freight rail switching wye, building a new trail, a new trail connection and new sidewalks to access the station area.

Project Description

In the Southwest Light Rail Transit Station area, several improvements are needed to increase access in and around the station. These include: new sidewalks, a new trail that connects two neighborhoods that are separated by a freight rail track, and removal of a freight rail switching wye. The switching wye is a barrier to pedestrian and auto access, particularly because it lies directly between a very large employer, Methodist Hospital, and the SWLRT Louisiana Station. Removing it would allow building a dedicated walkway/bikeway that would function as a convenient and comfortable way for employees to use the SWLRT easily and regularly. This reduces the need for cars and associated surface parking, which frees up land for transit-oriented development, and it increases transit usage.

Project Rationale

The Louisiana Station area has several businesses and employees within walking distance of the LRT station. Methodist Hospital is the largest employer with 3,900 employees on a daily basis. Access the station requires a circuitous ½ mile walk, because of the existing rail embankment and tracks. Removing the freight rail wye for a walkway/bikeway would reduce the distance to a ¼ of a mile. The walkway provides the opportunity for convenient transit service to workers and to increase ridership on the SWLRT line. The new trail to the east of the station, the trail underpass from the station to the Cedar Lake Regional Trail, and new sidewalks throughout the area connect neighborhoods to the Louisiana station area, providing direct and convenient access, reducing automobile dependence and thereby facilitating transit use and increased ridership.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

Minimal

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Louis Park

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. Louis Park

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Provide accessibility to Southwest Light Rail Transit Station

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Meg McMonigal
Principal Planner
952-924-2573
mmcmonigal@stlouispark.org

($ in thousands)

Louisiana Station Area Access and Circulation Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$173	$3,287	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$173	$3,287	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$346**	**$6,574**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$875	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$129	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$130	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$208	$50
Construction	$0	$0	$1,368	$700
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	($386)	($57)	$145
TOTAL	**$0**	**$618**	**$1,649**	**$895**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Whistle Quiet Zone

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$105
Priority Ranking:	4
Project Summary:	$1.05 million to install safety improvements that reduce or eliminate the need for rail horns and whistles.

Project Description

Improvements to areas where rail crosses roads, sidewalks and trails, would consist of two quadrant gates, closure of public crossings, 100' medians, and constant warning times to alert pedestrians and vehicles. These safety improvements aim to reduce risk of injury and fatalities along railroad crosses.

Project Rationale

LRT horns are effective deterrents to accidents at grade crossings. The sound level, however, can greatly affect the quality of life to surrounding residential neighborhoods. Whistle Quiet Zones (WQZ) help to elevate the safety at railroad crossings while mitigating the noise affects to residential areas. A WQZ is a segment of rail line where LRT horns would not be routinely sounded while the train approaches a public highway/railroad grade crossing. Safety measures include paired one-way streets with full closure gates, median barriers in combination with two-quadrant gates, four-quadrant gates, temporary crossing closures (during night hours), and wayside horns. Additional infrastructure at each railroad crossing is needed in order to allow the rail corridor to be eligible for WQZ status.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Louis Park

Who will operate the facility?

City of St. Louis Park

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Whistle Quiet Zones improve the quality of life by improving safety and reducing noise in the community.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Meg McMonigal
Principal Planner
952-924-2573
mmcmonigal@stlouispark.org

($ in thousands)

Whistle Quiet Zone

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$105	$0	$945
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$105	$0	$945
TOTAL	**$0**	**$210**	**$0**	**$1,890**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$105	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$105
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$840
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$33	$0	$299
TOTAL	**$0**	**$138**	**$0**	**$1,244**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
New Roy Wilkins Center	1	GO	$ 1,900	$ 131,778	$ 0
Minnesota Museum of American Art	2	GO	$ 8,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 9,900	$ 131,778	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 9,900	$ 131,778	$ 0

($ in thousands)

New Roy Wilkins Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,900
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$1.9 million in state funds is requested to finalize the architectural program and complete schematic design a new Roy Wilkins Center to replace the existing Roy Wilkins Auditorium and RiverCentre parking ramp.

Project Description

The Port Authority of the City Saint Paul requests support to reconstruct the Roy Wilkins Center and RiverCentre parking ramp. This request is for $1.9 million in state funding. The overall project costs are anticipated to be $267 million for the 246,000 square foot facility to design construct, furnish and equip a new Roy Wilkins Center and a 2,000 car RiverCentre ramp. The estimated capital construction cost in 2015 dollars is $161 million The reconstruction will include a flexible exhibition/meeting space with approximately 4000 seats and 40,000 square feet of exhibit space and a 20,000 square foot roof top green space, all for the purpose of attracting and hosting expanded civic events, conventions, and trade shows. The facility will also serve as a memorial tribute to Roy Wilkins and the civil rights movement in Minnesota. The Roy Wilkins Center will share existing structured parking and loading access with the RiverCentre complex. The existing ramp is to be demolished and a new ramp of 2,000 spaces will replace it.

Project Rationale

The current Roy Wilkins Auditorium is an important economic, educational, civic and cultural resources to Saint Paul and all of Minnesota, but it is outdated, difficult to maintain, and does not comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Minnesota misses out on the millions of dollars that would be spent here if more people and organizations could use the facility. That includes conventions and events lost to other markets and the hotel, restaurant and other spending associated with them

Past studies show that Saint Paul RiverCentre's approximate 64,000 square feet of exhibit space ranks at the lower end of the comparable set of facilities. Roy Wilkins exhibit hall and auditorium flat floor were not included in these analysis as this space is generally considered substandard to state-of-the-industry convention center exhibit space and is non-contiguous to the facility's primary space. Similarly, when considering breakout meeting space, the RiverCentre's 18,400 square feet also rank near the lower end of the comparable set, but at an appropriate ratio to its exhibit space. The RiverCentre's ballroom space ranks near the midpoint of the comparable facility offerings. Ballrooms are typically the most versatile and highly utilized areas within convention centers, and newer facilities are trending towards greater ballroom space offerings.

A reconstructed Roy Wilkins center would capitalize on the deficiencies mention above and provide

high quality contiguous exhibit space and leverage a highly desired ballroom-meeting room level.

The need to replace the 45 year-old RiveCentre Parking Ramp is based on a recently completed lifecycle engineering study of the ramp. The study indicates the life of the parking facility is nearing an end. The Study concludes that the ramp is in need of major repairs or replacement in the next 3 to 5 years. A simple cost/benefit analysis proves the best option is to replace the parking ramp.

Prior to the study it was believed the ramp had a longer life. The RiverCentre Ramp is an important part of the RiverCentre Complex as its revenue is a key to supporting the operations of the Convention Center.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The new Roy Wilkins Center will be operated by the RiverCentre Convention and Visitors Authority along with the existing RiverCentre convention facilities. Because the RiverCentre and Xcel Energy Center are operated as one complex, there are operating efficiencies and economies of scale that will enable the new Roy Wilkins Center to contain costs and enhance operating cash flow. While the plan of finance for the new Center has not yet been finalized, based on the assumptions reflected in pro-formas, the new Roy Wilkins Center show that the Center will generate positive cash flow each year, after covering all of its operating expenses and the projected level of debt service. This is consistent with the RiverCentre Authority's ongoing commitment to operate "in the black". Unlike most other major convention centers across the country, the Saint Paul RiverCentre receives no ongoing operational subsidy from the City of Saint Paul.

Who will own the facility?

City of St. Paul

Who will operate the facility?

The Roy Wilkins Center is operated by the Saint Paul Arena Company through a contract with the RiverCentre Convention and Visitors Authority

Who will use or occupy this space?

There are no long term contracts with private entities. All contracts with private entities are less than 30 days.

Public Purpose

The new Roy Wilkins Center will be used for a variety of entertainment, cultural and educational events. Its new flexible meeting space will be one of the Twin Cities most useful smaller venues for concerts, meetings, banquets, general sessions and graduations. Its new exhibition hall will host consumer and trade shows, banquets and other meetings. This Center will enjoy wonderful synergy with the RiverCentre and Xcel Energy Center. This addition to the RiverCentre complex will create a series of entertainment, meeting and hospitality spaces unparalleled in their capability to host a wide range of activities and draw hundreds of thousands of patrons, clients and other visitors.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Laurie Hansen
CFO
651-204-6215
ljh@sppa.com

($ in thousands)

New Roy Wilkins Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,900	$131,778	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$0	$133,678	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,900**	**$265,456**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$90	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,280	$13,799	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$9,063	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$161,200	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$1,507	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$5,875	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$530	$74,012	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,900**	**$265,456**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Minnesota Museum of American Art

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$8,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$8 million to establish permanent home for exhibitions and public programs for the Minnesota Museum of American Art (MMAA). This home will show case Minnesota Artists and complete certified rehabilitation of a historic Cass Gilbert building.

Project Description

MMAA is building a permanent home within the historic Pioneer Endicott buildings on the edge of the burgeoning Lowertown neighborhood in St. Paul. Located at the cross roads of a vibrant urban community directly on the Green Line, MMAA will transform the first floor of 3 architecturally significant 19th century office buildings into a bustling art museum and art education center complete with galleries devoted to American and Minnesota art and craft, classrooms, and community spaces. Over half of the museum's permanent collection of 4,000 objects is devoted to the work of Minnesota artists.

The MMAA project is an outstanding example of adaptive reuse. Its galleries are designed by the award winning Minnesota architectural firm of VJAA. They bring a contemporary interplay to this historic building. One of the Endicott's most important and distinctive features - the glass arcade designed by Cass Gilbert - will be integrated into the new MMAA galleries. The selection of the Pioneer Endicott as a permanent home for the MMAA also makes great economic sense. The development of 250 apartments in the upper floors offer a ready audience and historic tax credits on the building help provide affordable occupancy.

Project Rationale

- Establish a dynamic and innovative art museum in downtown St. Paul that celebrates American art and craft and the distinctive contribution that Minnesota artists have made to our arts culture both past and present.
- Bring an important historic building designed by Minnesota's most famous architect, Cass Gilbert, back to life as a 21st century hub for art and innovation.
- Create a sustainable art center enhancing the quality of life for all Minnesotans.
- Leverages significant private sector capital.
- Aids in the economy of our region by creating 14 permanent, full time livable wage jobs.
- Creates 108 construction jobs. ($9 million of construction) additionally project will create design, finance and legal employment.
- Increases visitors to St. Paul currently estimated at 45,000 per year.

- Increase development on and ridership on LRT.
- Increases indirect spending in the community by visitor and to vendors of the museum.

Other Considerations

This is a "ready to go" project with fundraising to date of $6.750 million.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

There is no impact on State or Port Authority budgets, MMAA is responsible for all program and facility operating costs.

Who will own the facility?

St. Paul Port Authority will enter into a long term lease (pre-paid) with the owner of the building and will in turn lease the space to MMAA.

Who will operate the facility?

Minnesota Museum of American Art

Who will use or occupy this space?

The facility will be leased to MMAA and they will be operating the public program of art museum.

Public Purpose

Economic development, job creation, utilization of public transportation infrastructure, enhances quality of life through the cultural programs.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None.

Project Contact Person

Laurie Hansen
CFO
651-204-6215
ljh@sppa.com

($ in thousands)

Minnesota Museum of American Art

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$8,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
GO Bonds-User Financing	$0	$6,750	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
GO Bonds-User Financing	$0	$2,655	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,405**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$2,000	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$500	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$11,500	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,405	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,405**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Kellogg - Third Street Bridge Reconstruction	1	GO	$ 47,875	$ 0	$ 0
Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center	2	GO	$ 19,500	$ 0	$ 0
Como Zoo Habitat Preservation Exhibit Renovation	3	GO	$ 14,500	$ 0	$ 0
Wakan Tipi Center at Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary	4	GO	$ 3,000	$ 0	$ 0
Dorothy Day Revision Phase 2		GO	$ 12,000	$ 0	$ 0
Science Museum of Minnesota Building Preservation		GO	$ 13,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 109,875	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 109,875	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Kellogg - Third Street Bridge Reconstruction

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$47,875
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge project will replace a multi-lane, structurally deficient bridge over Interstate 94 and multiple railways. Load restrictions were imposed on the bridge in 2014. The new multi-modal bridge will include upgraded bicycle and pedestrian facilities and capacity for the proposed Gold Line BRT that will link the East Metro with the hub of the regional transit system at the Saint Paul Union Depot.

Project Description

The heart of downtown Saint Paul sits on a bluff overlooking the Mississippi River and slopes downward to Lowertown, the historic warehouse district along the River where Union Depot, dozens of railroad tracks, and old brick buildings have been transformed to lofts, artists' studios, and office space. One-half mile northeast on a bluff overlooking downtown and the River sit the East Side neighborhoods of Dayton's Bluff and Payne Phalen, both of which are evolving into vibrant, culturally diverse communities. The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge is one of only two connections between downtown and Saint Paul's East Side, and crosses the low land near the Mississippi River, Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway tracks, the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary and Regional Trail, and six lanes of Interstate 94.

The bridge is approximately 0.4 miles long and, before it was restricted in 2014, carried two general purpose lanes and a 10 foot sidewalk on the south side. The most recent annual average daily traffic (AADT) published count on the bridge was 9,900 in 2012; forecast volume is 12,400 (2040). The City of Saint Paul conducted a traffic count in May 2015 which revealed a current volume of 11,600 daily vehicles.

After signs of stress were found on the bridge piers during routine inspections, the City of Saint Paul began supplementing regular inspections with increased monitoring, specialized inspection, and load capacity analysis. In 2014 the City was forced to close the outer lanes of the bridge because the piers that support them were deemed structurally deficient. However the inside lanes are fully supported by beams that transfer stresses directly to the columns and not to the cantilevers. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), outside consultants, and City of Saint Paul engineers confirmed that continued operation on the inner lanes of the bridge is safe. Since then, traffic on the bridge has been restricted to the three innermost lanes of the bridge with a narrow six-foot lane shared by bicycles and pedestrians. While operations on the center lanes are structurally safe, the outer lanes and sidewalk are unusable, and the shoulders and the shared bicycle and pedestrian lane are substandard in the reconfiguration. The reduced shoulder width also causes storage of plowed snow to encroach into the vehicular lanes, effectively reducing the lane width until snow removal can be completed.

On its east end, the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge intersects with Mounds Boulevard, a major thoroughfare through Dayton's Bluff that provides access to eastbound I-94 and distributes traffic

exiting the westbound freeway. Kellogg Boulevard becomes 3rd Street, a regular part of the neighborhood street network in Dayton's Bluff, serving mostly residential uses with some neighborhood commercial establishments. On its west end in Lowertown and the downtown core, Kellogg Boulevard is a main thoroughfare that serves Union Depot and offices, shops, restaurants, hotels, museums, and civic spaces in Saint Paul's central business district.

With the restrictions placed on the bridge, the Mounds Boulevard/Kellogg Boulevard intersection at the east end of the bridge is at level of service F in the evening peak period with intersection delay of 82 seconds per vehicle. In 2040 that delay increases to 130 seconds per vehicle. With a new Kellogg Bridge in place the delay would drop to 28 seconds and the intersection would operate at level of service C; by 2040 the intersection would operate at level of service E with delay increases to 56 seconds per vehicle.

Expected Users of the Project Include

Transit

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge is heavily used by transit commuters from points north and east. Local Routes 63 and 70, which serve the Dayton's Bluff and Sunray-Battlecreek-Highwood Neighborhoods use the bridge, as do limited stop Route 350 and express Routes 294, 351, 353, 361, and 364 which bring commuters from the Saint Paul suburbs of Maplewood, Oakdale, Woodbury, Saint Paul Park, Cottage Grove, and Stillwater to downtown Saint Paul. These routes connect to the METRO Green Line LRT, Amtrak, and intercity bus service at Union Depot. Because of the topography of the area, closure of the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge would mean significant detours for these bus routes and delay for more than 4,000 passengers each day.

In addition to current bus routes, Gold Line BRT will use the bridge. Gold Line BRT is a proposed transitway that will run in an exclusive guideway for most of its 12 mile length. Gold Line will run from Union Depot to Mounds Boulevard on the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge, then generally run parallel to I-94, connecting downtown Saint Paul with its East Side neighborhoods and the suburbs of Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale, Lake Elmo, and Woodbury. Gold Line BRT will operate all day bi-directional service every 15 minutes or more often. Stations are proposed at the west end of the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge at Union Depot, and at the east end of the bridge at Mounds Boulevard or Maria Avenue.

Another transitway corridor, the Rush Line, is in its early stages of planning. While a mode of transit and a route have not yet been selected, several Rush Line alignment options would use the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge to connect to Union Depot. The poor condition of the bridge limits current and future transit system improvements, a situation that is untenable given its proximity to Union Depot.

Bicycles

The City of Saint Paul recently adopted the *Saint Paul Bicycle Plan* , which identifies Kellogg Boulevard and the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge as a "Major Bikeway" and a key connection between downtown Saint Paul, the nearby regional trails, and new "Minor Bikeways" on Maria Avenue and Euclid Street on the East Side. Until the bridge was restricted in 2014, it had a shared 10.5-foot bicycle and pedestrian facility. With the current restrictions, bicycles and pedestrians moving in both directions share one six-foot lane, a condition that represents a loss of service for users, and one that is inconsistent with Saint Paul's existing and planned bicycle network. The proposed bridge includes improved multi-use facilities on each side of the roadway, a facility more than twice as wide as the lane currently available.

Pedestrians

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge connects downtown Saint Paul and Saint Paul's East Side, two districts where the robust sidewalk networks are well-used and are critical to quality of life and economic vitality of the neighborhoods. In the part of Dayton's Bluff closest to the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge, 36 percent of households do not own a car; in downtown, 21 to 28 percent of households are without a car. The number of households without cars in the East Side neighborhoods and downtown is among the highest in the Twin Cities. The sidewalk network is critical to maintaining mobility for these residents within their neighborhood, as well as to downtown Saint Paul. The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge provides this crucial link; however in its current condition it does not provide an adequate, safe connection.

Freight

Kellogg Boulevard is a 10-ton truck route in the City's freight network. Since the bridge was restricted the City has placed a "Legal Load Only" restriction on the bridge. No permits will be issued to trucks hauling more than the legal limit. Current lane closures on the bridge create frequent bottlenecks for goods movement. Approximately four percent of vehicles traveling on Kellogg Boulevard in the peak period are heavy commercial vehicles; this rate is typical of a downtown Saint Paul street.

Project Rationale

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge has been declared structurally deficient and must be replaced because of two major issues:

1. The bridge's substructure is compromised because the joints of the bridge, which allow it to expand and contract with the major temperature range present in Minnesota, are cracked from use. The cracked joints allow stormwater and melted ice and snow, which often carry heavy concentrations of road salt, to drip onto the piers below. The salty water becomes trapped in the concrete piers and corrodes the rebar within. Corrosion causes the rebar to expand, cracking and loosening the concrete around it. Once the concrete begins to fall off of the piers and the rebar is exposed, the piers deteriorate rapidly.
2. The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge was built in 1982, just as the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) updated the design code for bridge cantilevers. The cantilevers on the bridge were designed according to old, now obsolete code and are now cracked. This cracking combined with the deterioration of the piers makes the bridge unable to support any weight in its outer lanes.

Other Considerations

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge links critical low-income, minority neighborhoods to growing employment centers. A new bridge will provide opportunities for disadvantaged groups on the East Side and in downtown Saint Paul by removing physical barriers to job access, supporting continued community revitalization, and facilitating use of more affordable transportation

options such as bicycling, walking, and taking transit.

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge connects the Dayton's Bluff and southern segments of Payne Phalen neighborhoods to downtown Saint Paul. Dayton's Bluff is a low-income area. The most affluent areas of the neighborhood have a median household income of $50,000 but the poorest areas of the neighborhood have a median household income of $23,000 or less. The southern part of Payne Phalen is even poorer, with median household income hovering between $25,000 and $35,000. Approximately 44 percent of people living in the census block nearest the bridge in Dayton's Bluff have incomes below the poverty level, and the rates of poverty in the general area range from 25 to 54 percent. Compared to the seven county Metropolitan Area, Dayton's Bluff and Payne Phalen have higher percentages of Hispanic, Black, and Asian populations, higher percentages of people who have limited English proficiency, and much higher rates of poverty.

The Kellogg Boulevard Bridge also connects the neighborhoods of East Side Saint Paul to Lowertown and downtown Saint Paul, the regional's second largest job center with more than 65,000 jobs. The Minnesota state Capitol Building is on the north side of downtown and the offices of most state agencies and related employers are clustered around the Capitol. Downtown Saint Paul is also home to several hospitals, major finance, insurance, healthcare, and engineering firms, hosts a growing technology sector, and a major hospitality industry with most of Saint Paul's hotels and hundreds of restaurants. On the eastern side of downtown the Warehouse District of Lowertown has seen enormous growth as more than 3.5 million square feet of abandoned industrial warehouses have been renovated and converted to offices, apartments, condos, galleries, and retail space. Unlike many similar warehouse-artist neighborhoods across the country that transitioned quickly from artists' neighborhoods to gentrified neighborhoods, Lowertown has held onto its working/living artists through several artists cooperatives that offer affordable live-work spaces. The creative community continues to grow with designers, architects, musicians, programmers, and actors joining traditional media artists.

Several major investments in Lowertown have built on its creative enterprises to make the neighborhood a regional destination: relocation of the Saint Paul Farmers' Market in 1982 to Lowertown (a facility that serves as an opportunity for Hmong farmers, many of whom live on the East Side, to build wealth); renovation of the historic Union Depot completed in 2012; opening of the Green Line LRT between downtown Minneapolis and downtown Saint Paul in 2014 using Federal Transit Administration New Starts Funds, and finally, completion of the Saint Paul Saints Baseball Park in 2015.

The East Side is a developing job center in its own right, with several major redevelopment initiatives completed or underway to reinstate the nearly 5,000 jobs that left the East Side beginning in the 1970s when 3M, Whirlpool, and Hamm's Brewing all relocated their facilities elsewhere. Redevelopment initiatives have been led by small businesses, many of them minority-owned and oriented toward serving and employing East Side residents. As discussed previously, the topographical change between downtown Saint Paul, near the Mississippi River, and the East Side on the bluff, requires a bridge to connect the two areas. Access between downtown Saint Paul and the East Side is limited to bridges on Kellogg Boulevard and East 7th Street; therefore it is essential for continued economic growth that both conduits remain open and fully functional.

Replacement of the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge will also complement other investment opportunities on the East Side of Saint Paul. Metro Transit is in the process of investing $4 million to upgrade shelters and bus stops in low-income neighborhoods with high proportions of minority residents. These improvements will be funded by a $3.26 million Ladders of Opportunity grant from the Federal Transit Administration. Three bus stops on the east of the bridge on 3rd Street in Dayton's Bluff are under

consideration for improvements such as heat, new shelters, lighting, and transit information. These stops are on the Route 63, which uses the Kellogg Boulevard Bridge to travel from downtown Saint Paul to the East Side. Several other stops on East 7th Street, and Payne, Minnehaha, Arcade, and Maryland Avenues on the East Side are also under consideration for improvements.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will use or occupy this space?

This facility is a transportation facility used by the general public

Public Purpose

This is a public bridge for public use

Description of Previous Appropriations

There have been no previous state appropriations. We have been awarded $7,420,000 in Regional Federal Road and Bridge funds for 2018 that will come with a match to the federal funds from State Bridge Bonds of $1,855,000. for a total of $9,275,000 currently funded.

Project Contact Person

Katie Knutson
Government Relations
651-266-8519
katie.knutson@ci.stpaul.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Kellogg - Third Street Bridge Reconstruction

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$47,875	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$0	$1,855	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$0	$7,420	$0	$0
City Funds	$300	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$2,250	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$300**	**$59,400**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$1,500	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$300	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$50,900	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$300**	**$59,400**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	N/A
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$19,500
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	$19.5 million in state bonds is requested to pre-design, design, construct, provide project and contract administration, and provide furnishing, fixtures and equipment for the Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center.

Project Description

This 2016 request is for **$19,500,000** in state bond funding for pre-design, design, construction, furniture, fittings and equipment, and project management for a new River Recreation and Environmental Education Center located in the City of Saint Paul, Ramsey County. The intent of the center is to provide the general public greater access to the Mississippi River and new opportunities for river and nature related recreational experience, environmental education and stewardship currently unavailable to Saint Paul's and the region's inner city youth, residents and visitors alike.

This project is one of several projects now under various stages of planning, funding anddevelopment along the City of Saint Paul's 17 mile stretch of the Mississippi River, recently renamed the Great River Passage, www.greatriverpassage.org. Over the past 30 years, millions of dollars in local, state and federal funding have been invested in the 3,500 acres of Regional Parks along Saint Paul's 17 mile Mississippi River waterfront. These parks have included Upper Landing Park and Chestnut Plaza, and regional parks Harriet Island, Raspberry Island, Indian Mounds Regional Park, Lilydale Regional Park, Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary, and the Bruce Vento and Sam Morgan Regional Trails. These park projects enhance the value of adjacent residential property, help stimulate the local and state economy through new job creation, protect our environment, promote health and wellness, and provide nature based recreation to under-represented populations including people of color, physically challenged and economically disadvantaged persons.

Project Rationale

This project will provide new opportunities for youth, adults, and families across the region to access the river, participate in river and nature related recreational experience and environmental education initiatives, and will enhance the stewardship of the natural areas adjacent to the **Mississippi River Great River Passage** regional parks in **Saint Paul**.

Other Considerations

The current Watergate Marina, located within the Valley Reach of the Great River Passage, will be rebuilt as a new River Recreation and Environmental Education Center, to accommodate more river-oriented uses and activities. It will become a hub for nature-based recreational activity; a place where you can rent a canoe or kayak, fishing equipment, bicycles, cross country skis and snowshoes, or

have lunch along the river's edge at the new café; making this destination a year round activity center promoting a healthy, nature-based, active lifestyle. Environmental stewardship will be encouraged through classes and outdoor experiences.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of Saint Paul Parks and Recreation Department

Who will use or occupy this space?

There will be one or more private, contracted, concessionaire opportunities for the project, including, for example: café, outfitter, sport shop, river recreation, marina boating services and related businesses. Actual operators have not been determined.

Public Purpose

Provide outdoor, nature and Mississippi River based recreation to diverse populations for better overall fitness, wellnesss and nature appreciation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Not applicable

Project Contact Person

Katie Knutson
Government Relations Associate
651-266-8519
katie.knutson@ci.stpaul.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Great River Passage - River Recreation and Environmental Education Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$19,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$19,500**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$150	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,810	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$50	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$13,156	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$195	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$438	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,701	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$19,500**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	No
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	No

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	No
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Como Zoo Habitat Preservation Exhibit Renovation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$14,500
Priority Ranking:	3
Project Summary:	Predesign, design, and construct the Como Zoo habitat asset preservation for seals and sea lions.

Project Description

Maintaining Como Zoo's commitment to conservation education and marine mammal care is the aim of this asset preservation project at Como Zoo. The plan calls for replacing the current Seal Island—originally a WPA-era monkey habitat that was retrofitted in the 1980s—with a purpose-built habitat large enough to contain and exhibit all of Como Zoo's seals and seal lions year-round. With new underwater vistas, improved amphitheater viewing, and naturalistic landscaping to resemble the rocky coast of the Pacific Northwest, the new exhibit plan will also dramatically improve the visitor experience for nearly two million children and adults each year.

Currently the seals and sea lions are displayed in a variety of locations at Como. Seal Island was modified in the early 80s and was originally Monkey Island built during the WPA. During the winter months animals are moved inside the Marine Mammal Building, where Sparky is housed year round in a separate pool. Both facilities lack adequate collection management requirements, with additional new federal requirements on the horizon. A new habitat will provide year round use both indoors and outdoors that meets or exceed all regulatory requirements, and will continue to educate and inspire the public.

Project Rationale

Como Park Zoo and Conservatory has been a Minnesota tradition for more than five generations, inspiring nearly two million visitors every year with the wild and precious resources of our natural world. The most visited cultural institution in the state, Como is also Minnesota's leading provider of conservation education, offering free, family-friendly programs and interpretive moments that reach more than 500,000 children and adults each year—a student population that rivals that of the state's 10 top school districts combined.

For nearly 60 years, Seals and Sea Lions have been an important part of Como Zoo's conservation education programs. From the splashy fun of the "Sparky the Sea Lion Show," to the progressive pinniped training programs at Seal Island, Como Zoo's aquatic mammals serve as ambassadors for their wild cousins, teaching visitors more about the value of ocean conservation. In fact, more than half of the seals and sea lions in Como Zoo's care came to our facilities through partnerships with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other marine mammal rehabilitation centers. In

partnership with the University of Minnesota School of Veterinary Medicine, Como Zoo's keepers are recognized leaders in providing progressive animal training, expert veterinary care and safe harbor to marine mammals with special needs.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

City of Saint Paul Parks and Recreation

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Como Park Zoo and Conservatory welcomes nearly 2 million visitors annual at no charge to educate and inspire our public to value the presence of living things in our lives.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Katie Knutson
Government Relations Associate
651-266-8519
katie.knutson@ci.stpaul.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Como Zoo Habitat Preservation Exhibit Renovation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$14,500	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$1,100	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$15,600**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$156	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,202	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$427	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$10,961	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$157	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$980	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,717	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$15,600**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Wakan Tipi Center at Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	4
Project Summary:	$3 million is requested to pre-design, design, construct, contract administer, and provide furnishing, fixtures and equipment for development of an Interpretive Center at the Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary in Saint Paul.

Project Description

The **Wakan Tipi Center** will be a multi-use interpretive visitor center that will serve both the local community and the region as part of the regional park and trail systems. The Center will interpret the natural history and honor the cultural heritage of the Dakota tribes as well as the many traditions and ethnic groups represented in the area. The City will partner with the **Lower Phalen Creek Project (LPCP)** non-profit corporation in developing a community based design process for the interpretive program and the building design. LPCP will also seek private donations to fund portions of the building construction and interpretive exhibit creation.

Project Rationale

Approved Regional Park Master Plan identified the need for a facility for interpreting the natural and cultural history of the **Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary** in Saint Paul.

Other Considerations

The **Wakan Tipi Center** will serve as a place for community events, stewardship activities, educational programming and will include a café to serve visitors and community groups using the center.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

Lower Phalen Creek Project, a 501(c)3 non-profit corporation, under agreement with the City of Saint Paul.

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Wakan Tipi Center will include office space for the Lower Phalen Creek Project which will operate the facility within the conditions of a cooperative development agreement with the City of Saint Paul Parks Department.

Public Purpose

The Center will serve multiple public functions including environmental education, historical and cultural interpretation and will be open to the public with portions available for rent by community groups for meetings and other public gatherings.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No Previous State Bond funds. 2008 MET Council Grant for Acquisition of land and structures of $572,469

Project Contact Person

Katie Knutson
Government Relations Associate
651-266-8519
katie.knutson@ci.stpaul.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Wakan Tipi Center at Bruce Vento Nature Sanctuary

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$175	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$3,525	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,700**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$240	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$785	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$4,340	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$30	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$980	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$325	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$6,700**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Dorothy Day Revision Phase 2

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount: $12,000

Priority Ranking:

Project Summary: $12 million in state funds is requested for a grant to predesign, design, construct, furnish, and equip a Connection and Opportunity Center to serve as an integrated one-stop delivery system connecting persons at risk of becoming homeless, and persons working to move up and out of homelessness, to services that improve their health, income, housing stability, and well-being, to be located in the city of Saint Paul.

Project Description

The Connection and Opportunity Center, consisting of 76,466 square feet of service, office and dining space, will be located on the first two floors of a new 6-story building containing a total of 166,532 square feet. Permanent housing will occupy the top four floors of the building. Construction is anticipated to begin in May of 2017 and be completed by November of 2018. The facility will be located directly across the street from Higher Ground Saint Paul, Phase I of the New Vision for the Dorothy Day Center, in downtown St. Paul on Main Street.

This request for financing is for the first two floors that contain the Connection and Opportunity Center. Total estimated cost of the Connection and Opportunity Center is $36 million. Key funding sources include the State of Minnesota, Ramsey County and private foundation, corporate and individual donations.

The following full range of services needed by homeless adults will be provided:

- Offices for Catholic Charities staff who will work to connect homeless adults with employment, health and social services,
- a medical clinic run by Westside Community Health Services,
- offices leased and staffed by Ramsey County to provide mental health, benefit and other County services,
- computer labs and rooms for employment and skills training,
- dedicated space and services for Veterans who are at risk of or are experiencing homelessness,
- laundry and shower facilities,
- shared office and meeting space for the organizations that partner with Catholic Charities to provide services to homeless youth and adults,
- a kitchen and dining room providing meals to the persons whom Catholic Charities serves, and
- a social enterprise, such as a coffee shop, employing homeless youth.

Project Rationale

While the great number of Minnesotans experiencing homelessness persists since the great recession, proven strategies have been developed and are being effectively used to solve homelessness. It is critical that the state continue to invest in these strategies. A unique opportunity exists to build upon past state investments and advance proven and innovative strategies to prevent and end homelessness by funding construction of a connection and opportunity center as part of a broad and comprehensive public private partnership. This Connection and Opportunity Center will play a critical role in advancing Minnesota's Statewide Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness.

Other Considerations

The Dorothy Day Center, the current facility providing services to the homeless, was originally built more than 30 years ago as a day shelter for 50 people. Today, it struggles to serve 6,000 people every year and is open 24/7/365. Overrun and crumbling, the Dorothy Day Center is a chaotic place. It is difficult, if not impossible, for those experiencing poverty and homelessness to focus on the steps they need to take to get back on their feet. Consequently, they get stuck at the Dorothy Day Center. It is unacceptable for those in need and harmful to the entire community.

The new vision for the Dorothy Day Center is an integrated, two-building solution that will bring critical supports that do not exist today: dignified shelter, permanent homes and connections to services and supports that help individuals become more independent and self-sufficient. The success of this integrated approach depends on full funding and construction of both buildings – Higher Ground Saint Paul and the Connection and Opportunity Center.

$6 million in state general obligation bond funding was appropriated in the 2014 Capital Investment Act for the Higher Ground Saint Paul facility, the first phase of the New Vision for the Dorothy Day Center. An additional $17 million was awarded by the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency from the Housing Infrastructure Bond Appropriation in the 2014 Capital Investment Act.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No impact on the state operating budget.

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

Catholic Charities of St. Paul and Minneapolis

Who will use or occupy this space?

Catholic Charities of St. Paul and Minneapolis will offer resources for those at risk of becoming homeless and those working to move up and out of homelessness. Services will include housing search and placement, job training, computer labs, mental health services, access to Veterans' and other benefits, meals and a drop-in center. In partnership with Catholic Charities, Ramsey County will lease and staff offices in the Connection and Opportunity Center to provide mental health,

benefit and other county services.

Public Purpose

The goal of housing stability for all Minnesotans is consistent with the state's responsibility to protect the health, safety and welfare of its citizens.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Bev Turner
Catholic Charities Legislative Coordinator
612-325-5826
bev.turner@cctwincities.org

($ in thousands)

Dorothy Day Revision Phase 2

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$12,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
County Funds	$0	$1,694	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$4,574	$0	$0
City Funds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$16,479	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$35,747**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$3,762	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$372	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$943	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$26,770	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$3,400	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$500	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$35,747**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Science Museum of Minnesota Building Preservation

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount: $13,000

Priority Ranking:

Project Summary: $13 million is requested by the Science Museum of Minnesota for pre-design, design, and construction work to replace water-damaged elements of the building's exterior envelope and some resultant interior damage caused by latent design and construction defects. The work will render the building sound and properly functioning for the museum's continuation as a major Minnesota destination and a statewide resource for STEM education into the future.

Project Description

Remedial Work Done to Date

Short-term repairs identified by Inspec, Inc. (Minneapolis) and Clark Engineering (Minneapolis) and implemented by Restoration Systems, Inc. (Chaska) and Reiling Construction (Saint Paul) were completed during the 2014 and 2015 construction periods on the east walls (exterior and interior) and on the Omnitheater wall-to-roof intersections. This work focused on closing the openings that allow warm moist air to saturate the wall and roof insulation and deteriorate the steel wall studs, exterior sheathing and steel roof deck.

- Wall weep vents were installed in the brick wall on east side of building where water intrusion had caused significant damage to the interior of the facility.
- Primary and secondary caulk joints were installed with weeps on the cap stones in areas where significant water intrusion was noted.
- Silicone 123 tape was applied over metal panel caulk joints where there was failure of the caulking material due to faulty design that allowed continuous movement of the metal panels.
- Damaged brick and block, which cracked due to a lack of control joints was replaced and additional control joints were installed in areas that were repaired.
- A significant amount of wall insulation that was damaged due to water saturation was replaced, as was the vapor barrier.

- New sheetrock was installed and the walls were finished as required.

Current Status of Work

The Science Museum has enlisted a team of engineers, consultants and contractors to review all areas of deficiencies of the facility and provide detailed construction solutions to correct these deficiencies.

- We have engaged TEGRA Group (Minneapolis) as owners' rep for the project.

- We are currently negotiating a contract with a firm with experience in solving similar building issues to oversee the design solutions and remedial work.

- We will be working with McGough Construction (Saint Paul) as primary contractor.

- We have engaged the firm of LEGEND Technical Services, Inc. (Saint Paul) to monitor the building quarterly for signs of potential environmental issues.

Anticipated Work to Mitigate Current Damage and Prevent Further Deterioration

Phase 1:

The number one priority is repair of the exterior of the Omnitheater perimeter, or the Omnitheater Box. This will entail: removal of all exterior cladding; replacement of all damaged building materials; installation of an effective vapor barrier and flashing system; installation of a water screen drainage plane (moisture barrier) over exterior sheathing; replacement of the exterior cladding, i.e. metal panels & brick; installation and detailing of brick flashings, end dams, and control joints; and caulking of wall control joints.

Roof areas intersecting the Omnitheater Box must be redesigned to eliminate warm moist air from the interior of the building to escapee into the unconditioned areas of building wall cavities (continuous vapor barrier) causing frost and damage to the wall systems. Steel roof decks that are rusted must be removed and replaced when required or cleaned and treated to stabilize deterioration if salvageable.

This priority has been determined with the primary goal of preventing future damage to and potential closure of the Omnitheater due to water intrusion.

The cost of Phase 1 work has been estimated at $10.4 million by McGough Construction based on an analysis by Clark Engineering. The repairs to the Omnitheater exterior will take place over the construction season of 2016. Replacement of the remainder of the building's exterior metal paneling and parapet cap railings will be completed in the 2017 construction season, to reduce the number of contractor mobilizations needed to complete the project, thereby reducing cost as well.

Elements to be addressed in Phase 2 and beyond:

The Science Museum will be working with its team of engineers, consultants and contractors, as to which areas of the facility would be included in the next phases of repair. This would be based on the priority of need, impact on business operations, and the sequencing of work to minimize the cost of repairs.

Among the issues that will need to be addressed;

- A continuous vaper barrier must be installed in Omnitheater Box and throughout building.

- Parapet walls on the exterior terraces need to be removed and rebuilt with flashing and vapor barriers installed; caulk primary and secondary joints and weeps; remove and replace guardrails.

- Brick wall assemblies need to be redesigned and repaired or replaced. This includes: replacing through-wall flashing; installing end dams and new rope/vent weeps; repairing shelf angles and brick ties as needed; repairing grout, caulking, and mortar joints as needed.

- Metal panel assemblies. Remove exterior metal panels; repair or replace vapor barriers; install new insulation, exterior sheathing, and water-proof membrane drainage systems; install new metal panels; caulk as necessary.

- Roof/Wall intersections. Install continuous vapor barriers between vertical and horizontal planes. Address lack of termination of roof membrane on vertical surface. Replace rusted steel decking. Replace damaged roof insulation and membrane.

- Window openings. Replace head flashings; remove and replace existing window gasket with new gasket and thermal separators; torque pressure plate screws to the appropriate pressure; remove adjacent metal panels; install a water-proof membrane at the head joints of the window to complete required flashing of the window units; replace metal panels; caulk as required.

- Interior wall vapor barriers. Remove and replace damaged sheetrock on the inside of exterior walls; replace insulation as needed; address thermal transfer issues with structural steel

members; repair or replace unsecured and damaged vapor barriers on exterior walls.

The Cost of the Work; How it was Determined; and the Anticipated Sources of Funds

The estimated cost to remediate the current damage and to address its root causes is an estimate provided by McGough Construction based on design solutions provided by Clark Engineering is $26 million. This estimate is based on the assumption that the work would commence in 2016 and proceed through the construction season of 2020, but does not include expected inflationary adjustments.

Anticipated sources of funding include $13M in bonding funds from the State of Minnesota and matching funds coming from a variety of Science Museum resources and potential grant support from local foundations and corporations.

Matching funds will be provided by the Science Museum through the following resources—

Depletion of SMM's Building Preservation Fund (through FY 2021) $4M

Depletion of all current working capital funds ** $3M

Board-approved additional unrestricted endowment draw-down (FY 2016-2021) $2M

Traditional bank loan
$4M

Total
$13M

(** The museum will seek a line of credit to replace our working capital.)

Any philanthropic gifts received will help to offset the need to incur debt, which has a substantially negative impact on our general operating budget.

Project Rationale

The Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM) building located at 120 West Kellogg Boulevard in downtown Saint Paul, construction of which was completed in 1999, is prematurely aging due to

latent design and construction defects. The result of these defects is major damage caused by water infiltration. This damage necessitates the replacement of more than 150,000 square feet of metal panels and brick on the exterior of the building, insulating material, vapor barriers, and major remedial work on the water removal systems.

Intermittent symptoms of these design flaws have been apparent since the opening of the building in 1999. Through 2008, SMM partnered with the original designer and contractors to address these issues as they arose, each time receiving assurances that the problem had been "solved." Much of this work was completed under warranty given the age of the structure.

In 2010, responding to the recurring water infiltration issues, the museum contracted with Clark Engineering (Minneapolis) to conduct what became a series of independent investigations by a variety of subcontractors with expertise to uncover the true and full extent of the damage, its causes, and recommended short- and long-term remedial action. These analyses showed that the building as originally designed and constructed suffered from multiple major design defects and engineering deficiencies. These findings were confirmed by an analysis performed by Crane Engineering (Minneapolis) for Travelers Insurance in May 2014.

In 2012, the museum began aggressively pursuing legal recourse against the buildings designers and contractors. In January 2014 the Science Museum filed suit in Ramsey County District Court against the general contractors, subcontractor, and architect. In April 2015, Ramsey County Second Judicial District Court Judge William H. Leary ruled against the museum based on the expiration of the Statute of Limitations and Statute of Repose.

Since April, the museum's Board has moved quickly and decisively to establish a Building Preservation Fund of $3.8 million to address our highest priority repair needs, which will begin in the 2016 and construction season. We are seeking bonding support from the State of Minnesota because these building issues cannot be resolved without financial support that will enable the institution to continue to conduct its business and pursue its mission. It is imperative that we avoid a recurrence of the episode in February 2014 when the Omnitheater had to close for eight days when water literally began seeping in through the roof and walls.

It is vital that we address these building issues in a timely manner. Unchecked deterioration of key building components would necessitate business interruptions, potential building closures, and even more extensive and expensive remedial action and could impact our ability to keep the museum open to visitors.

These include:

- Continued deterioration of back-up steel stud walls, steel brick lintels, and steel roof deck;

- Damage to the exterior wall sheathing behind metal panels;

- Further damage to the brick façade;

- Potential closure of the programming areas including the Omnitheater, exhibit areas, and educational spaces, and office areas due to moisture/water intrusion into the facility;

- Recurring damage to the interior components of the facility, e.g. Omnitheater domed screen, exterior sheetrock walls in exhibit areas, carpet, etc.

Other Considerations

We believe that the reasons the museum's 2016 bonding request should be strongly considered are varied and persuasive.

- **The Science Museum is a statewide resource for STEM education as a field trip destination and as a major provider of school outreach programs, classroom learning resources and teacher professional development.** Including field trips, school outreach, and teacher professional development, the museum served more than 200,000 K-12 students and teachers in F 2015, reaching school districts in all 87 Minnesota counties. The museum's innovative school outreach and teacher professional development work have demonstrated a measureable impact on promoting equity in K-12 science learning, which is a critical element in addressing the state's Achievement Gap in STEM learning.

- **The Science Museum is an anchor cultural destination of downtown Saint Paul with 675,000 on-site visitors in FY 2015 (second only to the Xcel Energy Center) with a substantial economic impact for the city.** The museum's spending of $42 million in FY 2015, when combined with spending by the museum's 675,000 visitors during the same period translates to an annual economic impact of nearly $57 million generating $1,643,000 in local government revenue and $2,113,020 in state government revenue. This economic impact also translates to more than 1,800 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs).[1]

- **The Science Museum itself is a significant Saint Paul employer with a total of 880 employees including 296 FT-staff and 584 PT employees representing a total of 484 FTEs.**

- **The Science Museum is a leader in the science museum field, bringing national stature and prestige to Minnesota.** As a result of its leadership in the industry, the museum hosts visits from professional colleagues from throughout the U.S. on a regular basis .For example, in June 2015, as one of the lead organizations on a 10-year $40 million project funded by the National Science Foundation, the museum hosted a three-day meeting of some 300 museum professionals from throughout the U.S. that took place at the RiverCentre with 80 percent of participants staying at downtown hotels.

- **The Science Museum has a strong track record of fiscal responsibility as a result of actively seeking diverse revenue sources, rigorous monitoring of spending, and generous community support**. **In FY 2015, the museum operated with a balanced budget for the 33rd consecutive year**. Based on pre-audit numbers, 54 percent of our $42.7 million operating budget came from earned revenue, including admissions, program fees, memberships, sponsorships, exhibit sales, and food service; 21 percent came from state and federal support including more than $6 million in Federal grants; 20 percent came from private contributions and grants; and five percent was drawn from the museum's endowment and other investment income.

Total state funding for FY 2016 consisted of $1,079,000 in general operating support and $600,000 from the Arts & Cultural Heritage Fund in support of statewide programs for K-12 schools. State support represents just under four percent of the museum's operating budget.

- **State bonding funds in FY 2017 will leverage its previous investments in support of the creation of the museum's riverfront facility: $1.2 million in 1994 for planning and $30 million in 1996 toward construction.** The current request will leverage the state's prior investment by ensuring the continued viability of the building and our important work for the next generation. The building was also a key element of then Mayor Coleman's downtown riverfront revitalization initiative.

The other factor we would like the Bonding review panel to know is that prior to turning to the state, the museum made every reasonable effort to finance this work by holding the firms directly responsible for the faulty design and engineering work precipitating the damage legally accountable for its remediation. Unfortunately, the Ramsey County Second District Court dismissed the case determining the claims were barred by the Minnesota Statute of Repose 541.051.

[1] Estimates of the museum's economic impact are based on a calculation tool created by Americans for the Arts with partners including the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the Business Civic Leadership Center.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None

Who will own the facility?

City of Saint Paul

Who will operate the facility?

Science Museum of Minnesota

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Science Museum is a private 501 c 3 non-profit organization governed by a Board of Trustees. It is operated by the museum's staff of 296 FT-and 584 PT employees (total of 484 FTEs) and some 1,000 volunteers each year. It is used by more than 800,000 on- and off-site participants annually.

Public Purpose

The museum is an educational/cultural resource for the City of Saint Paul and the State of Minnesota. We create and present STEM learning experiences that engage our core audiences—families with pre-school and school-age children; K-12 students, teachers, administrators in every one of Minnesota's 87 counties; undeserved teens, i.e. youth of color and from low income households; and lifelong learners of all ages. Through our leadership of national museum collaboratives, the museum also exports exhibits and program to literally every one of the 50 states. As a major public attraction in downtown, the museum draws visitors to Saint Paul from Greater Minnesota, the Upper Midwest, the U.S. and around the world.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Jon Severson
Director, Corporate and Government Relations
651-221-9499
jseverson@smm.org

($ in thousands)

Science Museum of Minnesota Building Preservation

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$13,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other Funding	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Funding	$0	$6,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$26,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$3,464	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$730	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$21,806	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$26,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	No
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	No

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	No
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	

Staples, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Staples Community Center	1	GO	$ 9,200	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 9,200	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 9,200	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Staples Community Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$9,200
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The Staples Community Center has served the Staples Area since 1974, providing aquatic programming, Senior Services, fitness center and gymnasium based program. Additionally, Staples Motley Schools has utilized this facility since its inception. The facility is a the point where substantial renovations are necessary which will trigger ADA requirements to be met. Total project costs for the renovation and expansion are estimated to be $9.5 million in 2017 dollars.

Project Description

The Staples Community Center has served the Staples Area since 1974, providing aquatic programming, Senior Services, fitness center and gymnasium based programs for Staples and surrounding communities. Additionally, Staples Motley Schools has utilized this facility since its inception. The facility is at the point where substantial renovations are necessary which will trigger ADA requirements to be met. Total project costs for the renovation and expansion are estimated to be $9.5 million in 2017 dollars.

The scope of the Staples Community Center renovation and expansion includes:

* Demolition, relocation and reconstruction of walks and Centennial Avenue, including new sewer and water service

* New structure for the new multi-purpose, multi-use gymnasium (16,758 sq. ft) and a second story walking track

* Two story addition to the west which will house an expanded Senior Citizen area, offices and a family locker room on the Lower level (5747 sq. ft.); and fitness training room on upper level (5747 sq. ft)

* Elevator and other required ADA accessibility will be met

* Sprinkler system installed

* East side of building remodeled to serve expanded meeting rooms and offices for future tenants

* New roof installed on existing building with new RTU HVAC system.

* High efficiency lighting installed

* New mechanical equipment for existing gymnasium

* New boilers for heating building and domestic water

* Tuck-pointing of existing brick veneer and sealants

* New flooring in new upper level cardio room

* Updated restrooms, locker room, and kitchen accessibility will be addressed

Project Rationale

The Staples Community Center sits in the heart of an area covered by Todd, Wadena, Cass, and Morrison Counties, providing opportunities for fitness, recreation, aquatics, and senior programming for the communities of Staples, Motley, Bertha, Hewitt, Eagle Bend, Clarissa, Browerville, Long Prairie, Verndale, Wadena, Sebeka, Menahga, and Pillager.

Examples of ways the Staples Community Center currently impacts this region include the following:

1. Organized youth swim lesson programs contracted for the communities of Verndale, Motley, Pillager, and Bertha/Hewitt.

2. Staples Community Center is known as a training center for lifeguards and water safety instructors with participants for other community programs of Long Prairie, Browerville, Wadena, Sebeka, Menahga, and Parkers Prairie.

3. The community center offers adult based aquatic programs of lap swim, Aquacise and adult

lessons with participants from all areas.

4. A Senior Lutheran Social Services daily nutrition program which includes daily meals and meals on wheels is based at the Staples community center and has become a gathering place for area seniors to exercise and participate in senior activities.

5. The Staples Community Center provides a meeting place for public and private events such as fireman's dance, annual arts and crafts sales, birthday parties, and concerts, to name a few.

6. The Staples Motley School District leases the Staples Community Center for activities such as the girls swim team, youth and adaptive aquatics, volleyball practice, basketball practice, baseball practice and tournaments. Surrounding school districts participate in many tournaments sponsored by Staples Motley Boosters Clubs at the Staples Community Center.

7. Persons from surrounding towns and townships use the Staples Community Center's fitness center.

8. As of June 1, 2015, the Staples Motley Community Education program is based at the Staples Community Center.

This area of outstate Minnesota (Todd & Wadena Counties) has a low income/high poverty level population. The Staples Community Center which has been solely funded and operated by the City of Staples, provides opportunities for all ages to gather and become active within this four county area in central Minnesota. The City of Staples is limited in the funding available to provide for renovations and expansion of the Staples Community Center.

Other Considerations

Future considerations, additional revenue could be made with collaboration with the Lakewood Health System, Kinship, Chamber of Commerce, and expanded school use.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional state operating dollars will be requested.

Who will own the facility?

City of Staples

Who will operate the facility?

City of Staples

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

This facility is utilized by residents of several counties, the Staples Motley School and other area School Districts as well as local health care facility.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous appropriations have been made for this facility.

Project Contact Person

Jerel Nelsen
City Administrator
218-894-2550
jnelsen@ci.staples.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Staples Community Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$9,200	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$400	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$9,600**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$529	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$7,536	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$235	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$682	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,982**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Unsure
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Unsure
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Unsure
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Lake Wobegon Trail Extension (St. Joseph to Waite Park)	1	GO	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Lake Wobegon Trail Extension (St. Joseph to Waite Park)

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$1 million in State funds is being requested to assist, where necessary, with engineering, construction, design, landscaping, acquisition and other associated costs that may be incurred for the Lake Wobegon Trail Extension Project located between the City's of St. Joseph and Waite Park, in Stearns County.

Project Description

The proposed trail will run adjacent to an existing Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) active rail line. Currently, rail service includes one train a day traveling at 10 mile per hour, serving approximately 6 large businesses. The Stearns County Parks Department is proposing to purchase the south 20 feet of the BNSF railroad right of way and BNSF has verbally agreed to proposal. Other private property will also be purchased. The proposed trail will be 10 feet wide; approximately 3.2 miles long, and have a bituminous surface. An expansion bridge will be needed to cross over the Sauk River.

The total cost of the Lake Wobegon Trail Extension is estimated to be $4 million. Key funding sources for this project include: State Legacy Grant Program, MN DNR Federal Recreational Trail Grant Program, Federal Transportation Alternative Program, City of St. Joseph, St. Joseph Township and Stearns County. We have received verbal confirmation that both the City of Waite Park and the City of St. Cloud are also going to contribute to this project.

The Lake Wobegon Trail extension will connect the metro St. Cloud area to the existing 62 miles of Lake Wobegon Trail, the 55 mile long Central lakes Trail and the 10 mile long Soo Line Trail. It will also connect the greater St. Cloud area to the current 311,000 annual trail users. The trail extension runs through the City and Township of St. Joseph, the City of St. Cloud and Waite Park.

The construction of the Lake Wobegon Trail extension would continue the existing 62 miles of trail from where it currently ends in St. Joseph into Waite Park's Rivers Edge Park. The completion of the Lake Wobegon Trail to Waite Park creates trailhead access with parking and facilities for over 100,000 people in the greater St. Cloud area. This extension would also connect to the existing Harold P. Nelson Healthy Living Trail and in the future to the Glacial Lakes/ROCORI and Beaver Islands Trails. Currently, the closest trailhead for the St. Cloud population is in St. Joseph. This corridor extension will intersect with the Sauk River state canoe route and will provide a bicycle/hiking connection to the 2,500 acre St. John's campus.

The current Lake Wobegon Trail attracts local, regional, out of state and people from foreign countries. The ten foot wide extension of the Lake Wobegon Trail into Waite Park places a trailhead within close proximity to the Crossroads Shopping Center, restaurants, B&B's and hotels in St. Cloud and Waite Park. It provides a lighted trailhead at Waite Park's Rivers Edge Park with accessible parking, bathrooms, water, a splash pad and ball fields.

Project Rationale

The Lake Wobegon Trail extension of 3.2 miles is needed because it will connect the St. Cloud metro to the existing 62 miles of Lake Wobegon Trail, the 55 mile long Central Lakes Trail and the 10 mile long Soo Line Trail. It will also connect the greater St. Cloud area to the current 311,000 annual trail users. Currently, local residents, regional residents and tourists that either live in or are visiting St. Cloud metro and want to access the Lake Wobegon Trail from the city cannot easily do this without riding on the shoulder of busy city county and state roads. This extension will provide a safe and separated 10 foot wide, bituminous surface in which walkers, rollerbladers, bikers, and in the winter snowmobilers, dog sledders and fat-tire bikers will be able to use.

The long term goal of the greater St. Cloud area is to extend the trail all the way to the Mississippi River. The Lake Wobegon Trail Extension is the next step in realizing this goal.

Other Considerations

Securing funds that support building the trail extension is an important step in completing the east to west pedestrian bicycle corridor across the greater St. Cloud area. In addition, this corridor construction is another step in connecting to the Waite Park trail head (River's Edge Park). This segment of trail will also provide a connection to the scenic Sauk River Canoe and Boating Route.

The St. Joseph to Waite Park segment of the Lake Wobegon Trail extension is identified in the Stearns County Comprehensive Plan and the Area Planning Organization (APO) Transportation Plan. Burlington Northern Santa Fe and its partner, Northern Lines, have indicated that Stearns County's Rail with Trail plans are acceptable to them. The Stearns County Engineer, Stearns County Surveyor and Stearns County Attorney staffs are developing the document to proceed with negotiations with BNSF and other landowners. Funds have also been secured for land acquisition. There are several landowners parallel to the BNSF corridor have expressed interest in donating corridor for this project.

The engineering and design company for the Lake Wobegon Trail extension has been selected and is thus underway. The engineering plans for Phase I are complete and Phase II plans are about 60 percent complete. We are currently working on soliciting bids to construct the 900 foot segment in Waite Park. We hope to have this part of the project completed sometime this fall. An appraisal of the approximately 3.2 miles of BNSF corridor/private property should be completed in the next couple of weeks. After the appraisal is approved by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources we will make offers to the mentioned entities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None that we are aware of.

Who will own the facility?

Stearns County

Who will operate the facility?

Stearns County

Who will use or occupy this space?

The Lake Wobegon Trail is a public trail and therefore anyone who wishes to use it for its designed purposes can do so.

Public Purpose

To provide a safe and separated transportation trail that will connect to existing trail systems.

Description of Previous Appropriations

There has not been any previous bonding money appropriated towards the Lake Wobegon Extension Project.

Project Contact Person

Ben Anderson
Operations Coordinator
320-654-4725
benjamin.anderson@co.stearns.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Lake Wobegon Trail Extension (St. Joseph to Waite Park)

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$1,250	$0	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$150	$0	$922	$0
City Funds	$174	$26	$0	$0
County Funds	$25	$0	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$10	$0	$0	$0
Non-Governmental Funds	$9	$0	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$812	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$1,618**	**$1,838**	**$922**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$1,207	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$161	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$250	$1,707	$856	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$131	$66	$0
TOTAL	**$1,618**	**$1,838**	**$922**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Unsure
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Thief River Falls, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Thief River Falls Wellness Center	1	GO	$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 7,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Thief River Falls Wellness Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$7,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Pre-design, design, construct, furnish and equip a new 37,500 sq ft field house with four multipurpose courts and a walking/running track as well as build out an existing vacated building to house Child Care facilities, expanded fitness center, locker rooms, game/class room, party room, and office space for the Thief River Falls Wellness Center to be located in Thief River Falls, MN. Construction cost of $14,000,000 plus the non-cash benefit of the use of a major portion of the existing building currently appraised at over $11,000,000. $7,000,000 is requested in State funds.

Project Description

The TRF Wellness Center will be a multifunctional center with the wellness center being a major component. Population wellness is an aspiration for health systems as the Affordable Care Act progresses. Health plans will pay health systems for keeping people well rather than for medical procedures. Health systems will therefore have an incentive to prevent illness. Lowering obesity rates and promoting cardiovascular health are important objectives to prevent a variety of chronic and pervasive illness in populations. The wellness center serves the need of health systems to improve the health of those that they serve.

Child care is currently in short supply in Thief River Falls and this facility will help to expand the hours that child care is available to serve the make off hour working shifts that families rely upon.

Additional gym and court space is needed in the community to serve the athletic leagues. Currently Pennington County owns a community gym in a 1930's era facility that is at the end of its useful life. This facility could replace that gym and add additional capacity that is needed.

Thief River Falls continues to have expanding employment and a shortage of workers. Busses currently bring workers each day from 40, 50 and 70 miles away. We are expanding our housing supply using tax abatements as an incentive to get more housing for workers available. A 100 unit facility is currently under construction. In addition to housing, Thief River Falls needs to have this type of amenity to attract new residents to live and work here.

This facility has a master plan that includes an aquatic center. While the aquatic center is not a part of this project, the completion of this phase does not have to be the end of the development of our Community Wellness Center.

The facility will continue to have and eye clinic on site and there will be space to develop some retail and a clinic. Additional purposes will make this a true central gathering spot for people from all walks of life.

Project Rationale

This project is a goal of TRForward, a grassroots movement of Thief River Falls area citizens formed with the goal of making a Livable Community with Economic Opportunity. Working together, TRForward will serve youth and families and create an environment that helps to recruit and retain a quality workforce. This will be accomplished by public leadership from citizens who will take pride in improving and enhancing Thief River Falls.

A survey of 1,825 area residents was conducted to determine the needs and desires of the community. The results of the survey and subsequent focus group discussions were a series of goals for the community including number five (5) Thief River Falls will have a sustainable, indoor recreation center by 2017

The proposed wellness center will serve as a community gathering place where people from all walks of life will gather and pursue their individual interests. Space will be available for volleyball, basketball and tennis leagues, for personal training on the track or the exercise facilities, youth fitness and playground and child care.

This will be a place for the entire community to gather and make connections with people they may not meet otherwise. A sense of community and a community gathering place was a need identified in our focus groups.

Other Considerations

This plan will make use of a large building that was formerly a medical clinic and surgery center. These functions have been moved to a new clinic facility across town. It is in an excellent location with pedestrian and bicycle trails planned in the future

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No additional State funding is anticipated

Who will own the facility?

The City of Thief River Falls

Who will operate the facility?

Sanford Health in a joint venture with an experienced wellness center management organization. We are currently in talks with the YMCA to bring their expertise in planning an operating this center.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Sanford Health will continue to operate an eye clinic here and may establish a clinic and an outreach clinic on the site. There is a small space for an unspecified retail operation. The majority of the building will be dedicated to wellness and the funds in this project will not be used to improve the areas which are for the private purposes of Sanford Health.

Public Purpose

This facility will improve the lives and health of our citizens and serve as an attractive amenity for those who are considering making Thief River Falls their new home and place of employment.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Larry Kruse
City Administrator
218-681-2943
lkruse@citytrf.net

($ in thousands)

Thief River Falls Wellness Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Non-Governmental Funds	$0	$11,000	$0	$0
Other Funding	$0	$7,000	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$25,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$11,000	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$420	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,800	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$9,331	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,449	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$25,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Two Harbors, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Two Harbors Small Craft Harbor Facility	1	GO	$ 750	$ 5,000	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 750	$ 5,000	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 750	$ 5,000	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Two Harbors Small Craft Harbor Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$750
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$750,000 in state funding is requested for design / engineering of a small craft / safe harbor on Lake Superior within the City of Two Harbors.

Project Description

This project replaces a former plan for a small craft harbor on state property adjacent to the City owned land. The design work is for a proposed harbor that will be created by lengthening the existing dock 400-500 feet and adding docks. It will provide boat slips for visiting boats 26 feet and longer for periods up to ten days. Utilities and water will be provided at the slips. Boaters will be within walking distance of the downtown businesses as well as historic destinations.

Project Rationale

The design and engineering for a small craft harbor will be the next phase of this project. The first phase will be the pre-design which is anticipated to be completed in 2016 The pre-design will be funded through non-state funding and local funds. This project is a long awaited implementation of the North Shore Harbors Program (1991) and a critical component of the system of small craft harbors on Lake Superior. Boaters will benefit with dockage & a place of refuge during storms. The project will benefit the regional economy by increasing tourism and business associated with harbors & marine amenities along the North Shore. Non-boaters will benefit with an improved view of the working harbor and the interest recreational boats generate.

Other Considerations

The facility is a compliment to the recently re-constructed public access on Agate Bay and another example of an improvement to the working waterfront of Two Harbors. This small craft harbor will further strengthen and enhance economic, cultural, scenic and natural resources of the area as well as create a safe docking facility during inclement weather. This project would be part of a larger plan to fully develop the City of Two Harbors Waterfront into a regional destination along the North Shore.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

N/A

Who will own the facility?

The City of Two Harbors owns the property and the project will be in cooperation with the Department of Natural Resources.

Who will operate the facility?

The facility will be operated by the City of Two Harbors in cooperation with the Department of Natural Resources.

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

This facility will provide navigational safety to boaters and tie-ups for recreational boats traveling on Lake Superior. The facility will help to revitalize the waterfront of Two Harbors (which is currently underutilized and a former industrial site) and generate positive economic impacts to the city and the region.

Description of Previous Appropriations

No former funding for this specific proposal.

Project Contact Person

Dan Walker
City Adminstrator
218-834-8803
dwalkertharbors@frontier.com

($ in thousands)

Two Harbors Small Craft Harbor Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$750	$5,000	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$45	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$100	$1,200	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$895**	**$6,200**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$134	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$750	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$11	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$6,200	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$13	$105	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$908**	**$6,305**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	No
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Virginia, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Miners Memorial Community Center Upgrade and Expansion	1	GO	$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 4,000
Total Project Requests			$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 4,000
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,000	$ 4,000	$ 4,000

($ in thousands)

Miners Memorial Community Center Upgrade and Expansion

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$4,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Four Million Dollars is being requested of State Bonding funds for the purpose of renovation and reconstruction of the Miner's Memorial Community Center.

Project Description

The Miner's Memorial Building, a facility of the City of Virginia, built in 1959 has served the community and surrounding regions for many diverse activities. Our facility originally built for basketball was turned into a hockey facility in 1960. The Miner's Memorial Building was built for the needs of the 1950's and 1960's, those needs are now quite different under current requests in 2015.

The City of Virginia has kept up quite well in the overall visual perspective condition of the building with upgrading the refrigeration system in the Cuppoletti Arena, adding a second sheet of ice known as the Padgett Arena and updating other various maintenance items such as lighting, seating, handicap accessibility that were completed as funds became available. The overall need is to bring this facility to the efficiency and modernization that not only serves the community but the region with a facility we are all proud of.

The main focus of building renovation/construction is the mechanical and electrical systems upgrade (phase one of three). Phase one will provide locker rooms for gender equality, spectator safety, and efficiency to our entire building. In the 1950's and 1960's participates did not bring hair dryers and skate sharpeners with them for games, they do now and our overloaded electrical system can not handle this. Also various events such as weddings, sports shows, conferences and public meetings requirements for electrical needs that we can not satisfy under our current conditions. The theme here is safety and efficiency for everyone.

We also want to make it clear that our needs are of a Regional concern in the usage of this Community Center for hockey games, playoffs, meetings, weddings, benefits, high school events and various civic and social parties. We have many surrounding communities and residents that use our facility or attend events here year round.

Project Rationale

The Miner's Memorial Building was originally constructed in 1959 which is in great need for mechanical and electrical updates/renovation to its aging system that will provide efficiency and will ensure safety.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

With the mechanical and electrical system being updated and renovated the impact on the operating budget will be minimized due to efficiency. There are no additional State Operating Funds for this request.

Who will own the facility?

The City of Virginia

Who will operate the facility?

The City of Virginia with the Park and Recreation Department

Who will use or occupy this space?

Public Purpose

Community Center that will provide for the civic, social and recreational activities for our residents and the surrounding region.

Description of Previous Appropriations

no previous appropriations

Project Contact Person

John Tourville
City Administrator

218-748-7500
johnt@virginiamn.us

($ in thousands)

Miners Memorial Community Center Upgrade and Expansion

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,000**	**$8,000**	**$8,000**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$800	$800	$800
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$6,475	$6,475	$6,475
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$725	$725	$725
TOTAL	**$0**	**$8,000**	**$8,000**	**$8,000**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Yes
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	No
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Washington County — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Gateway Corridor Transitway	1	GO	$ 3,000	$ 18,000	$ 25,500
Red Rock Corridor Transitway	2	GO	$ 1,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 4,000	$ 18,000	$ 25,500
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 4,000	$ 18,000	$ 25,500

($ in thousands)

Gateway Corridor Transitway

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$3 million in State funds is requested to pay for the State's share of the engineering and environmental analysis work for the Gateway Corridor transitway for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

Project Description

Project Rationale

Every day, more than 90,000 vehicles cross the Minnesota-Wisconsin border on I-94. By the time a commuter reaches downtown St. Paul, the number of vehicles increases to 143,000. Along the way, the corridor crosses a beltway with the second highest traffic volumes of the metro interstates. The Gateway Corridor will give residents and commuters a transportation option that improves travel time, lessens congestion and provides connections that are currently absent. This transit solution best meets the established public purpose of improving mobility by providing a cost-effective, economically viable solution that promotes economic development, protects the natural environment, and preserves community quality of life and overall safety. Highlights include new, consistent, all-day service within a fixed-guideway that will operate along with existing express service and will provide easier connections to key destinations within the corridor and throughout the region.

Other Considerations

This project has a broad range of supporters including the Gateway Corridor Commission; the Woodbury, Oakdale, and St Paul business chambers; the Metropolitan Council; the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB), East Metro Strong, and others associated with the implementation of multi-modal transportation options.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The operation Cost, estimated annually at $11.5 million starting in 2022, would be split 50/50 between the Metropolitan Council and the Counties Transit Improvement Board. This is consistent with the regional model and statutory requirements for the other transitways in the region in operation.

Who will own the facility?

State of Minnesota

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

The public purpose of the Gateway Corridor project is to provide transit service to meet the existing and long-term regional mobility and local accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public within the project area.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Jan Lucke
Transit and Planning Manager
651-430-4316
jan.luke@co.washington.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Gateway Corridor Transitway

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$2,000	$3,000	$18,000	$25,500
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$0	$0	$218,250
County Funds	$0	$5,000	$10,000	$33,500
Other Funding	$0	$15,000	$40,000	$114,750
TOTAL	**$2,000**	**$23,000**	**$68,000**	**$392,000**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$25,000	$68,000	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$392,000
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$1,320	$3,591	$20,697
TOTAL	**$0**	**$26,320**	**$71,591**	**$412,697**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Unsure
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

($ in thousands)

Red Rock Corridor Transitway

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$1,000
Priority Ranking:	2
Project Summary:	The Washington County Regional Rail Authority (WCRRA) is requesting $1 million in state funding for engineering, environmental analysis and preparation of an application to seek federal transit administration funds for the Red Rock Corridor transitway located within the Cities of Minneapolis, St Paul, Newport, St Paul Park, Cottage Grove and Hastings within Hennepin, Ramsey, Washington and Dakota Counties.

Project Description

An Alternatives Analysis (AA) study was completed in 2007 that recommended expanding bus service, increasing bus frequency and providing additional park-and-ride facilities as the first steps toward building a stronger transit base in the Corridor. The Red Rock Corridor Commission adopted an Alternative Analysis Update (AAU) in March 2014. The AAU recommends Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) as the alternative that is best aligned with the Commission's approved objectives. This recommendation was made in consultation with the Red Rock Corridor Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and presentations to the public in a variety of forums and media. The AAU also recommends a staged implementation plan to move toward the development of BRT. By 2030, the corridor is projected to serve up to 2,500 riders per day.

In early 2015, the Red Rock Corridor Commission began an Implementation Plan for the Red Rock Corridor, which includes updating station area planning, updating ridership forecasts, developing a detailed financial plan and construction schedule, and pursuing the implementation of bus rapid transit from Hastings to Saint Paul. Part of this process is to have the transit route and mode accurately reflected in Metropolitan Council's Transportation Policy Plan (TPP). Once this happens, the project will be bond eligible for design and construction funds.

This request is for $1,000,000 in state funding for engineering, environmental analysis, and preparation of an application to seek federal funds for the Red Rock Corridor transitway.

Project Rationale

The Red Rock Corridor has regional, statewide, and national significance as a primary transportation route for automobile, truck, and rail travel. The Metropolitan Council projections for 2030 show the entire length of Highway 61 in the study area as a congested corridor. With the projected traffic growth and no planned improvements, all key locations on Highway 61,

including ramps and intersections, are forecast to be gridlocked during both peak periods in year 2030.

The existing bus service is equally affected by congestion on Highway 61 and I-94. No transit alternative is currently available from Hastings to downtown Saint Paul or downtown Minneapolis. As population and employment increase, demand for transportation also increases. Due to job growth in Minneapolis and Saint Paul, increased mobility and greater access to employment is needed for both downtowns. The project would also provide system connectivity to increase transit destinations for persons using existing and planned transit systems in the Twin Cities area.

Other Considerations

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The operation costs would be split 50/50 between the Metropolitan Council and the Counties Transit Improvement Board. This is consistent with the regional model and statutory requirements for the other transitways in the region in operation.

Who will own the facility?

State

Who will operate the facility?

Metro Transit

Who will use or occupy this space?

n/a

Public Purpose

This project meets the established public purpose of improving mobility by providing a cost-effective, economically viable solution that promotes economic development, protects the natural environment, and preserves community quality of life and overall safety.

Description of Previous Appropriations

In the 2011 Legislative session, $1,250,000 in state bond funding was allocated to the Newport Transit Station, a critical stop along the Red Rock Corridor. One million dollars in state bond funds for the Red Rock Corridor was requested in the 2014 legislative session. The bond funds were not awarded.

Project Contact Person

Jan Lucke
Transit and Planning Manager
651-430-4316
jan.lucke@co.washington.mn.us

($ in thousands)

Red Rock Corridor Transitway

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$1,000	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$0	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$1,000**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	N/A
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	No
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	Yes
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

West St. Paul, City of — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Robert Street (State Trunk Highway 952A) Reconstruction Project	1	THC	$ 12,000	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 12,000	$ 0	$ 0
Trunk Highway Cash (THC) Total			$ 12,000	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Robert Street (State Trunk Highway 952A) Reconstruction Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$12,000
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$12 million in State funds is requested to assist with the reconstruction of State Trunk Highway 952A (South Robert Street) in West St Paul.

Project Description

The reconstruction of State Trunk Highway 952A includes the entire 2.5 mile corridor located in the City of West St Paul. The project includes the replacement of aging storm sewer and water utilities,the replacement of the road surface, the development of a center median for improving safety conditions, new sidewalks and street lighting system, and new intersection control lighting. Fiber optics will also be installed to control the intersection control devices as well as supporting the development of a county wide broadband system.

This State Trunk Highway reconstruction project costs are falling disproportionately on West St Paul taxpayers. The total phase 1 project cost is $36,418,766 and the funding sources breakdown as follows:

Federal Government	$8,000,000	22% of project cost
State of MN	$5,600,000	16% of project cost
Dakota County	$2,000,000	6% of project costs
St Paul Water	$1,138,000	4% of project costs
Cities of IGH/ St Paul	$ 31,000	.1% of project costs
City of West St Paul	$19,649,766	54% of project costs

The Robert Street project will result in an increase in property taxes of $150 for the average household. As a fully developed community with an aging population, this will cause a significant financial burden to local taxpayers.

The City's request for $12 million of State help will be directed toward the actual construction costs for reconstructing Robert Street.

The project commenced at the beginning of the 2015 construction season and will continue through the 2016 construction season., ending sometime around November 30, 2016. Eureka Construction was selected as the prime contractor for this project.

Project Rationale

The condition of this section of the MN Trunk Highway system is ranked in the bottom 8% of all MN State roads. It also ranks in the top 5 MN highway sections for vehicle crashes. The road section is expected to grow to over 32,000 vehicles/day. The aging infrastructure creates a growing barrier for

successful commercial and retail opportunities which negatively impacts annual State sales tax revenues. The current road conditions has a direct and negative impact on the current perception, future growth, and long term stability of West St Paul as businesses struggle to succeed, commercial investors search elsewhere, and homeowners select alternative locations to live.

The unsafe and deplorable conditions of this section of State Trunk Highway resulted in the City of West St Paul finding it necessary to move forward with the reconstruction of this corridor in a two year project ending in 2016. The City received an $8,000,000 federal grant which required to be spent against by mid 2015 or the grant could have been rescinded. The competitive bidding environment in 2015 resulted in bids coming in $4 million over engineering estimates and the established financing plan. The City would have preferred to solicit additional State resources prior to starting the road construction, but the road's current condition and the potential of losing 25% of the project funding did not allow for that to occur.

This State Trunk Highway reconstruction project costs are falling disproportionately on West St Paul taxpayers. The total project cost is $36,418,766, including inflation, and the City is finding itself responsible for 54% of the overall project cost while the State of Minnesota is only supporting 16% of the costs of this State highway project.

Other Considerations

The City is committed to working towards the jurisdictional turnback of this section of State Trunk Highway. We are aware of MNDOT's interest in seeing this occur. This jurisdictional turnback would also require the involvement of Dakota Count, as the corridor should ultimately become part of the County's system.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

The use of this highway is unchanged. As a result, there should not be any additional State operating support required.

Who will own the facility?

State of Minnesota, unless the jurisdictional authority is formally turned back to local authorities.

Who will operate the facility?

The State of Minnesota will continue to have all responsibility for its maintenance and upkeep.

Who will use or occupy this space?

NA

Public Purpose

The highway corridor will continue to serve as a major highway serving the region. It is expected to

handle over 32,000 vehicle trips every day There is approximately $18m of State sales tax generated from the commercial businesses located on this highway corridor. Following reconstruction, the amount of State sales tax can be expected to increase. This is a direct benefit to the State. The community and region also benefit from residents and businesses electing to invest in the area in order to be close to the services available on the corridor. These benefits will include increased property taxes and will also include an improved quality of life resulting from new businesses and services being offered on the corridor.

Description of Previous Appropriations

The State's current contribution includes the following:

Cooperative Agreement Funding:	$0.7M
CIMS Funding	$3.5M
Traffic Office and ADA Funding	$1.4M
Total MNDOT Contribution	$5.6M

These appropriations were made in 2014

Project Contact Person

Matt Fulton
City Manager
651-552-4101
mfulton@wspmn.gov

($ in thousands)

Robert Street (State Trunk Highway 952A) Reconstruction Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
Trunk Highway Cash	$0	$12,000	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Other State Funds	$5,600	$0	$0	$0
Federal Funds	$4,000	$4,000	$0	$0
City Funds	$5,871	$1,779	$0	$0
County Funds	$1,000	$1,000	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$585	$584	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$17,056**	**$19,363**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$4,670	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$140	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$4,326	$900	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$7,920	$18,128	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$335	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$17,056**	**$19,363**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	N/A
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Western Lake Superior Sanitary Dist — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy Project	1	GO	$ 15,200	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 15,200	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 15,200	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy Project

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$15,200
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	$15.2 million in state funds is requested to construct a combined heat and power system for Western Lake Superior Sanitary District regional treatment system. The combined heat and power system will generate electricity from methane-rich biogas byproduct of the wastewater treatment process, and will recapture heat from the process for use in WLSSD's existing regional wastewater treatment facility.

Project Description

Along with clean water, wastewater treatment facilities can produce clean energy. Biogas, a methane-rich byproduct of the treatment process, can be used along with other wastes to create electricity. With this project, WLSSD will not only generate electricity utilizing all the biogas it currently produces, but also plans to reclaim other high-strength wastes to produce additional biogas and electricity—meeting about 50% of treatment plant electrical needs. Additionally, this process produces substantial heat that will be recaptured for use in the treatment process year around and seasonally as building heat, reducing the need for purchased natural gas.

WLSSD's Combined Heat and Power Project (CHP) will build off an $11.2 million WLSSD locally-funded project that includes the installation of nine modular boiler units and biogas conditioning (treatment) equipment under construction in 2015. The 2015 boiler project reduces WLSSD's overall energy consumption and increases the efficiency of the treatment process.

Total project cost: $30.4 million (including inflation)

Funding sources:
$15.2 million Minnesota Capital Assistance bonding funds
$15.2 million State Revolving Fund loan (federal loan funding source administered by Public Facilities Authority; repaid with local funds)

WLSSD's CHP project will reduce energy consumption and increase the organization's energy self-sufficiency. The project is planned in three phases:

Phase 1 – 2016-2017: **Estimated cost $9.84 million.**
This phase will reduce WLSSD's overall energy consumption through modifications to the plant heating and ventilation systems, improvements to the digester heat exchangers and improvements to the electrical distribution system. Various components of this phase will reduce the wastewater treatment plant's electrical demand, improve system reliability and prepare for future co-generation of heat and power.

<u>Electrical Improvements Design and Construction</u>

- Includes improvements to the main plant electrical gear to feed power from the future engine generators to the treatment plant's electrical grid (distribution system). A new 1,000 sq. ft. facility will be constructed to house the new electrical gear.
- Provides redundancy in order to improve overall maintainability and reliability
- Addresses condition issues associated with existing 40-year-old equipment and results in improved overall reliability necessary for a future on site combined heat and power generation system.

Heat Recovery Design and Construction

- Modify various areas of the treatment plant's heating and ventilation systems in order to reduce requirements for heating outside air including; heat recovery from exhaust of existing air compressors, outside air reduction in the digestion facility, and recovery of heat from the plant water (plant effluent) distribution system.
- Equipment will be installed and replaced in approximately 5,400 sq. ft. of existing facility space.

Heat Exchanger Improvements – Digesters

- Include replacement of the existing hot-water-to-sludge heat exchangers with sludge-to-sludge heat exchangers. These improvements will address condition issues with the existing heat exchangers and reduce overall heating demand for heating the digesters by recovering heat from the existing sludge.
- Approximately 7,200 sq. ft. of existing digestion facility space will be modified to accommodate the heat exchangers and associated equipment.

Phase 2 – 2017 - 2018: Estimated cost $10.56 million.

In this phase, WLSSD will install two 825kW engine generators that will use biogas to generate electricity for use in powering the wastewater plant. The generators are estimated to produce electricity on site to meet about 35% of WLSSD's total wastewater treatment plant electricity needs. Additionally, this process produces substantial heat that will be recaptured for use in the treatment process year 'round and seasonally as building heat, reducing the need for purchased natural gas.

Engine Generator Design and Construction

- This project includes the design and construction of two 825kW engine generators with consideration for a future third engine generator.
- This construction phase also includes the installation of additional biogas treatment equipment for removal of siloxanes.
- Approximately 13,000 sq. ft. of existing facility space will be modified to accommodate the generators and associated equipment.

Phase 3 – 2019-2020: Estimated cost $4.5 million.

In this phase, WLSSD will increase biogas generation and electricity production by directly adding high strength wastes such as fats, oils and grease and food waste into WLSSD's existing anaerobic digesters. Current digester capacity allows for a significant increase in biogas production. This phase will allow WLSSD to generate electricity on site to meet 50-100% of total plant electricity needs.

High Strength Waste Addition to Digesters

- This project includes design and construction of equipment required to receive high strength industrial wastes and food waste for the purpose of pulping and pumping into our existing

anaerobic digesters to increase gas production and, therefore, electricity production.

Project Rationale

WLSSD is uniquely positioned to serve the public by providing both clean water through effective wastewater treatment and cogeneration of clean, renewable energy. With the installation of a combined heat and power system, WLSSD can better serve the region and the state and will also contribute to meeting Minnesota's renewal energy goals—with a cleaner and cheaper solution to energy needs.

Biogas, a natural gas, is a byproduct of wastewater treatment at WLSSD. This biogas is produced in WLSSD's four existing anaerobic digesters used to manage wastewater solids. Currently, a portion of this methane-rich gas is used to heat buildings—meeting about 8% of WLSSD's energy needs. Excess gas that cannot be used is currently flared off, wasting this resource.

Purchased electricity has become the largest non-payroll cost in WLSSD's wastewater operations, driving tough budgetary decisions and increased rates to users. At nearly $3 million annually, electricity accounts for about a third of 2015 non-payroll wastewater treatment plant operating costs. WLSSD's electricity rates have increased by 66.4% since 2006. With annual electrical rate increases of 5 to 9 percent, wastewater rates will continue to rise for businesses, residents and forest-products industries that are major employers in northeastern Minnesota.

In the past three years, WLSSD has reduced its electricity consumption by 18%. Electricity rates are increasing so rapidly, that we have only realized a 6% savings in electricity.

A combined heat and power system will allow WLSSD to generate electricity, utilizing 100% of the biogas currently produced, and will also be able to reclaim other high-strength wastes to produce additional biogas within the existing facility. WLSSD will continue to recover heat for the wastewater treatment process and for buildings. The system will position WLSSD to meet 50 to 100% of treatment plant electrical needs—eliminating the need to purchase electricity, controlling costs and, ultimately, wastewater rates for businesses, residents and industries across 17 communities.

Other Considerations

It is WLSSD's vision to become energy independent and generate 100% of the electricity needed to operate its wastewater treatment plant.

Similar to WLSSD's plans, clean water agencies that are successful in tackling energy efficiency and recovery in their facilities, have focused on effective biogas utilization and the addition of other high strength wastes.

Only a handful of Minnesota's clean water agencies are currently using biogas to generate electricity on site to meet a portion of their electrical needs. When WLSSD's Combined Heat and Power project is complete, wastewater facilities across the state can look to WLSSD's plan and projects as an example to reduce energy consumption and beneficially use byproducts to create cleaner, cheaper energy, and to stabilize rates.

WLSSD is well-positioned to act on its clean energy plans as a result of locally-funded capital investments and a comprehensive Energy Vision. WLSSD's Combined Heat and Power project will build off an $11.2 million, locally-funded WLSSD project that includes the installation of nine modular boiler units and biogas conditioning facility under construction in 2015. The boiler project reduces WLSSD's overall energy consumption and increases the efficiency of the treatment process. In

2001, WLSSD also completed the construction of its locally-funded $33 million anaerobic digestion facility, in which the biogas is produced as a by-product of wastewater solids processing.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

n/a. WLSSD operations do not rely on operating funds from the state.

Who will own the facility?

Western Lake Superior Sanitary District

Who will operate the facility?

Western Lake Superior Sanitary District

Who will use or occupy this space?

n/a

Public Purpose

WLSSD's Combined Heat and Power Energy Project will position Western Lake Superior Sanitary District (WLSSD) to generate up to 100% of the electricity needed to power its regional wastewater treatment facility in northeastern Minnesota—saving about a third of annual non-payroll operating costs and enabling WLSSD to stabilize wastewater rates for businesses and residents in 17 communities (including Duluth, Proctor, Hermantown and Cloquet) and 4 industrial customers (including SAPPI and Verso pulp and paper mills). Additionally, WLSSD will also recover heat from the process for use in wastewater treatment processes and buildings. This project will help keep wastewater treatment effective and affordable while contributing toward Minnesota's renewable energy goals with clean, cost-effective energy.

Description of Previous Appropriations

n/a

Project Contact Person

Marianne Bohren
Executive Director
218-740-4805
marianne.bohren@wlssd.com

($ in thousands)

WLSSD Combined Heat and Power Energy Project

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$15,200	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
Federal Funds	$0	$15,200	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$30,400**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$2,490	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$22,410	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$5,500	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$30,400**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

White Bear Lake Area School District — Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
White Bear Lake Area Community Achievement Center	1	GO	$ 17,225	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 17,225	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 17,225	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

White Bear Lake Area Community Achievement Center

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$17,225
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	The proposed White Bear Lake Area Community Achievement Center is a facility located in White Bear Lake that will house programs designed to eliminate the achievement gap by ensuring that all students are ready for kindergarten by providing a holistic, innovative approach to early childhood and family education.

Project Description

The proposed White Bear Lake Area Community Achievement Center is a facility located in White Bear Lake that will house programs designed to eliminate the achievement gap by ensuring that all students are ready for kindergarten by providing a holistic, innovative approach to early childhood and family education. Centrally located in a densely populated portion of the school district and on an existing bus line, the facility will provide a comprehensive early childhood experience for students ages birth to five years old and their parents/guardians. A state appropriation of $15 million is required for site acquisition and preparation, building design, and construction.

By combining existing school district programs including school readiness, screening, early childhood family education, early childhood special education, adult English language and adult basic education with services provided by community partners, the center would provide a hub for families in need. The proposal would include the local food shelf, healthcare providers for basic health care, immunizations, prenatal care, dental care and co-located mental health supports. The vision for this site also includes county supports for Women, Infants and Children (WIC), child care assistance, a Bridges for Benefits help desk, interpreters and other support programs for families and children.

Project Rationale

It is the vision of the participating entities to create a community school that addresses the needs of children and families in such a way that will allow White Bear Lake Area Schools to eliminate the achievement gap for students entering kindergarten. The center would provide a continuum of wrap-around supports for families including prenatal care, kindergarten readiness and support for caregivers to decrease barriers for families.

The State of Minnesota has recently increased funding for preschool education, a strong indication that policy makers understand the importance of preschool education. Access to high quality programming will become increasingly important. The concept of an inclusive early education model is critical to ensure that students of all abilities are prepared for kindergarten. The State of Minnesota expects school districts and communities to align services to meet the needs of all students to be ready for kindergarten. The proposed building and the services provided align with the philosophy of a community school. The Coalition for Community Schools describes community schools in the following way:

Using public schools as hubs, community schools bring together many partners to offer a range of supports and opportunities to children, youth, families and communities. Partners work to achieve these results: Children are ready to enter school; students attend school consistently; students are actively involved in learning and their community; families are increasingly involved with their children's education; schools are engaged with families and communities; students succeed academically; students are healthy - physically, socially, and emotionally; students live and learn in a safe, supportive, and stable environment, and communities are desirable places to live.

Other Considerations

Citizens from three different counties (Ramsey, Anoka and Washington) would access the services at this site, with the majority from Ramsey County. Additionally, White Bear Lake Area Schools serves 10 municipalities.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

White Bear Lake Area Schools will operate the facility with existing resources. The facility would not impact the State's operating budget.

Who will own the facility?

White Bear Lake Area Schools (ISD #624) will own the facility.

Who will operate the facility?

White Bear Lake Area Schools (ISD #624) will operate the facility and will coordinate appropriate agreements with participating partners.

Who will use or occupy this space?

White Bear Lake Area Schools (ISD #624) and several key community partners will occupy the space. School district programs housed in the facility will include school readiness, early childhood family education, early childhood special education, enrollment services, adult English language and adult basic education. Community partners include the local food shelf, community based healthcare and a mental health provider.

Public Purpose

White Bear Lake Area Schools is a public school district serving the children and families from 10 northeast metropolitan municipalities.

Description of Previous Appropriations

Project Contact Person

Wayne Kazmierczak
Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Operations
651-407-7516
wayne.kazmierczak@isd624.org

($ in thousands)

White Bear Lake Area Community Achievement Center

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$17,225	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
Pending Contributions				
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,225**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$2,500	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$0	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$12,500	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$2,225	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$17,225**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	Yes
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	No
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Unsure
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Yes

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	N/A
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Unsure
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	No

Windom, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Emergency Services Facility	1	GO	$ 2,200	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 2,200	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 2,200	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Emergency Services Facility

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$2,200
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Windom Emergency Services Facility

Project Description

State bonding funds of $2.2 million and local matching funds will be used to design, construct and furnish a 20,000 square foot Emergency Services Facility in Windom. The preferred site is a 76,000 square foot park that is adjacent to the Cottonwood County Law Enforcement Center and current City of Windom Fire Hall.

A new facility is badly needed to adequately house Fire & Ambulance emergency services. The cost of a facility (design & construction) is approximately $4.5 million not including land acquisition or other related land costs.

Due to the low median incomes in Cottonwood County and the low tax base the City and townships are unable to raise the funds needed to construct the facility.

Project Rationale

Windom's existing fire hall is over 40 years old, contains just six bays and has only very limited support area. The total area in the existing facility is only 4,100 square feet. The existing Fire Hall space is so small numerous pieces of equipment are stored off-site; however, this space also houses a portion of the Windom Ambulance Services with two ambulance units (in separate garages) with a third ambulance located off-site. Equipment scattered among several different locations across the community leads to inefficiencies in the delivery of emergency services and creates slower response times.

The fire hall no longer accommodates the quantity or size of equipment required by today's average fire department. The Fire Department is currently storing fire fighting and rescue equipment in several locations throughout the city. Due to the storage inadequacies, when emergency calls are received, equipment is not always readily accessible by the department. The fire hall's shortcomings include its inability to adequately accommodate the department's equipment; its inability to provide sufficient space for rapid, unhindered movement of firefighters and EMTs within the facility; and its inability to provide sufficient space to prevent accidental interaction between firefighters, EMTs and equipment, thereby creating serious safety issues. Because of the size of the confined space and the close proximity of firefighters, EMTs and equipment there are also air quality issues.

The Fire Department, Ambulance Service and City Council have identified the need to replace the fire hall that was originally built in 1964. At the May 19, 2015 City Council meeting the City Council adopted the Emergency Services Facility project as it's #1 priority.

The Windom fire district provides fire services to the City of Windom, City of Wilder, City of Bingham Lake and nine townships located in Cottonwood and Jackson counties consisting of 190.5 square

miles of rural township area. The Windom Ambulance service area is over 200 square miles in area and serves these municipalities plus the City of Jeffers. Due to the rural nature of the area, declining rural population and low household median incomes, these cities and townships do not have the resources needed to contribute additional funds to fully pay for a new Emergency Services Facility.

The City's Fire Department is comprised of 30 volunteer firefighters and operates 14 pieces of equipment that need to be stored in a central location to facilitate optimum response times. The Ambulance service has 17 volunteer EMTs and operate 3 rigs, which make over 600 runs per year so these are critical services for the protection of the public health, safety and welfare.

Other Considerations

The City of Windom is incurring the cost of the land, relocation of electrical lines and playground equipment and pre-design expenses.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

No impact on State operating budget. Increase in operating costs for the facility incurred by the City of Windom.

Who will own the facility?

City of Windom

Who will operate the facility?

City of Windom

Who will use or occupy this space?

Volunteer Fire Fighters and EMT Personnel

Public Purpose

Fire and Ambulance Services

Description of Previous Appropriations

No previous appropriations for this project. A previous bonding project was completed by the City and MN DNR (2008 bonding) for a dam removal and installation of rock riffles.

Project Contact Person

Steve Nasby
City Administrator
507-831-6129
snasby@windom-mn.com

($ in thousands)

Emergency Services Facility

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$2,200	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
General Fund Cash	$0	$20	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
City Funds	$0	$2,200	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,420**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$0	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$11	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$240	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$20	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$3,700	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$37	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$55	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$357	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$4,420**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	Yes
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	No
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	Unsure
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	No
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	Yes
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	Unsure

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	Unsure
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	No
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Unsure
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	Yes
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	No
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes

Winnebago, City of

Projects Summary

($ in thousands)

Project Title	Priority Ranking	Funding Source	Project Requests for State Funds 2016	2018	2020
Winnebago Northwest Area Utility Improvements	1	GO	$ 3,740	$ 0	$ 0
Total Project Requests			$ 3,740	$ 0	$ 0
General Obligation Bonds (GO) Total			$ 3,740	$ 0	$ 0

($ in thousands)

Winnebago Northwest Area Utility Improvements

AT A GLANCE

2016 Request Amount:	$3,740
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Summary:	Requesting $3,740,000 grant for the Winnebago Northwest Area Utility Improvement. Total reconstruction of Water distribution, sanitary collection and storm water collection in a 25 block area originally constructed in the 1940's and 1950's. The project will alleviate health and safety concerns related to residential flooding, asbestos and lead containing drinking water pipes, potential contamination of storm water runoff and overloading of municipal wastewater plant.

Project Description

Full project is $6,606,880 Street and Utility reconstruction encompassing 25 City blocks. Funding request entails only utilities, planning and engineering costs. Regulatory compliance with CWA and State rules affecting water quality and sustainability

Project 1 – Reduce and mitigate surface flooding & institute best practices to storm water collection and treatment system

- Environmentally sound alternatives for treatment and infiltration of storm water
- Construction of a bio-retention basin to hold and treat storm water
- Rehabilitate and improve existing collection system

Project 2 – Reduce volume of clean water in sanitary collection system

- Identify and eliminate sources of inflow and infiltration
- Replace aging vitrified clay pipe mains and inspect services for illicit connections

Project 3 – Update water distribution system to eliminate hazardous materials and upgrade to modern standards for health and safety.

- Replace asbestos cement and cast iron water mains and lead service pipes.
- Update hydrants and gate valves for operational and fire protection safety

Project Rationale

These Projects benefit local, regional, state and national interests as listed below:

Project 1 –Provides reduced surface flooding and reduces pollutants in the Blue Earth River

- Surface water can be collected and treated or removed efficiently

  Improves water quality in surface waters and provides aquifer recharge

•

Project 2 – Reduce treatment and pollution in the collection system

- Eliminate cross connections with storm water
- Eliminate or reduce leaking pipes or connections

Project 3 – Promote safety and health improvements in safe drinking water distribution

- Provides the opportunity to eliminate asbestos and lead containing pipes
- Provides enhanced and reliable fire protection

Other Considerations

The fundamental reason for these requests is to make compliance and sustainability affordable:

- Financial analysis of this project estimates an increase of $28.75 per month per household
- Additionally, the City tax levy would be impacted in the order of $200 increase per year per household
- Previous plans and projects to make improvements were scuttled due to high costs and low income levels of residents.
- In its current state, the project will cause large increases in the City's operating levy and utility rates making them unaffordable for current residents. It is likely many residents will abandon or forfeit their homes and properties, leaving more of the assessments and enterprise funds unpaid or underfunded.

Impact on State Operating Subsidies

None, outside of current request. Operations and Maintenance would be covered by the City.

Who will own the facility?

City of Winnebago

Who will operate the facility?

City of Winnebago

Who will use or occupy this space?

None

Public Purpose

Protect Public Health and Safety. Natural Resource preservation.

Description of Previous Appropriations

None

Project Contact Person

Chris Ziegler
City Administrator - Clerk - Treasurer
507-893-4774
cziegler@cityofwinnebago.com

($ in thousands)

Winnebago Northwest Area Utility Improvements

PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
State Funds Requested				
General Obligation Bonds	$0	$3,740	$0	$0
Funds Already Committed				
City Funds	$0	$25	$0	$0
Pending Contributions				
Other State Funds	$0	$180	$0	$0
Other Local Government Funds	$0	$3,564	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,509**	**$0**	**$0**

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS

Cost Category	Prior Years	FY 2016	FY 2018	FY 2020
Property Acquisition	$0	$50	$0	$0
Predesign Fees	$0	$25	$0	$0
Design Fees	$0	$1,006	$0	$0
Project Management	$0	$0	$0	$0
Construction	$0	$5,601	$0	$0
Relocation Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
One Percent for Art	$0	$0	$0	$0
Occupancy Costs	$0	$0	$0	$0
Inflationary Adjustment	$0	$827	$0	$0
TOTAL	**$0**	**$7,509**	**$0**	**$0**

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
M.S. 16B.335 (1a): Construction/Major Remodeling Review (by Legislature)	No
M.S. 16B.335(3): Predesign Review Required (by Dept. of Administration)	
Does this request include funding for predesign?	N/A
Has the predesign been submitted to the Department of Administration?	N/A
Has the predesign been approved by the Department of Administration?	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(1): Sustainable Building Guidelines Met	N/A
M.S. 16B.325(2) and M.S. 16B.335(4): Energy Conservation Guidelines	

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	
The following requirements will apply to projects after adoption of the bonding bill.	
Do the project designs meet the guidelines?	N/A
Does the project demonstrate compliance with the standards?	N/A
M.S. 16A.695: Public Ownership Required	Yes
M.S. 16A.695(2): Use Agreement Required	N/A
M.S. 16A.695(4): Program Funding Review Required (by granting agency)	Yes
M.S. 16A.86 (4b): Matching Funds Required	No
M.S. 16A. 642: Project Cancellation in 2021	Yes
M.S. 16A.502 and M.S. 16B.31 (2): Full Funding Required	Yes
M.S. 174.93: Guideway Project	
Is this a Guideway Project?	N/A
Is the required information included in this request?	N/A
M.S. 16A.86 (6) Resolution of Support and Established Priorities	Yes